



*Solano Transportation Authority*

One Harbor Center, Suite 130  
Suisun City, California 94585

Area Code 707  
424-6075 • Fax 424-6074



*Members:*

Benicia  
Dixon  
Fairfield  
Rio Vista  
Solano County  
Suisun City  
Vacaville  
Vallejo

**INTERCITY TRANSIT CONSORTIUM  
AGENDA**

**10:00 A.M., Wednesday January 26, 2005**  
**Solano Transportation Authority**  
**One Harbor Center, Suite 130**  
**Suisun City, CA**

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>STAFF PERSON</u></b>
<b>I. CALL TO ORDER</b>	Jeff Matheson, Chair
<b>II. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2005</b> (10:00 – 10:05 a.m.)	
<b>III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA</b> (10:05 – 10:10 a.m.)	
<b>IV. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT</b>	
<b>V. REPORTS FROM CALTRANS, MTC, AND STAFF</b> (10:10 – 10:15 a.m.)	
<b>VI. CONSENT CALENDAR</b> <i><u>Recommendation:</u> Approve the following consent items in one motion.</i> (10:15 – 10:20 a.m.)	
<b>A. Minutes of the Consortium Meeting of December 22, 2004– Pg. 1</b> <i><u>Recommendation:</u> Approve minutes of December 22, 2004.</i>	Johanna Masiclat
<b>B. STA Meeting Schedule for First Quarter 2005 - Pg. 6</b> <i><u>Informational</u></i>	Kim Cassidy
<b>C. Funding Opportunities Summary- Pg. 8</b> <i><u>Informational</u></i>	Sam Shelton

## VII. ACTION ITEMS

- A. Review of Draft Three Elements of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) 2030** Dan Christians  
Recommendation:  
*Recommend the STA Board release the three elements of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) 2030 update for 30 day review and comments*  
(10:20 – 10:30 a.m.) – Pg. 15
- B. FY 2005-06 TFCA 40% Program Manager Guidelines and Call for Projects** Robert Guerrero  
Recommendation:  
*Recommend the STA Board approve the following:*  
  - 2005-06 Solano TFCA 40% Program Manager Guidelines.*
  - Authorize the Executive Director to initiate a Call for Projects for the FY 2005-06 TFCA Program Manager funds.*  
(10:30 – 10:40 a.m.) – Pg. 17
- C. Rio Vista Transit Study** Elizabeth Richards  
Recommendation:  
*Forward to the STA Board the approval of the Rio Vista Transit Study.*  
(10:40 – 10:50 a.m.) – Pg. 33
- D. SolanoLinks Transit Consortium Draft 2005 Work Plan** Elizabeth Richards  
Recommendation:  
*Approve the SolanoLinks Transit Consortium Work Plan for 2005 as specified on Attachment A.*  
(10:50 – 11:00 a.m.) – Pg. 96
- E. Legislative Update – Jan 2005** Daryl Halls  
Recommendation:  
*Forward the following recommendations to the STA Board:*  
  - Support for ACA 4.*
  - Support for ACA 7.*  
(11:00 – 11:10 a.m.) – Pg. 100

## VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. State Budget Update – Jan 2005** Daryl Halls  
Informational (11:10 – 11:20a.m.) – Pg. 122

- |   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
| <b>B. STA Board Retreat to Discuss Funding CTP and New Initiatives</b><br><i>Informational</i> (11:20 – 11:25 a.m.) – Pg. 166     | Daryl Halls        |
| <b>C. Status of Unmet Transit Needs Process for FY05/06</b><br><i>Informational</i> (11:40 – 11:45 a.m.) – Pg. 180                | Elizabeth Richards |
| <b>D. FY 2004-05 STP/CMAQ</b><br><i>Informational</i> (11:25 – 11:30 a.m.) – Pg. 182  | Mike Duncan        |
| <b>E. Project Delivery Update</b><br><i>Informational</i> (11:30 – 11:35 a.m.) – Pg. 185  | Mike Duncan        |
| <b>F. Regional Measure (RM 2) Program Update</b><br><i>Informational</i> (11:35 – 11:40 a.m.) – Pg. 187                           |                    |
| <b>G. Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) FY04/05 Six-Month Report</b><br><i>Informational</i> (11:45 – 11:50 a.m.) – Pg. 193 | Anna McLaughlin    |
| <b>H. SNCI Monthly Issues</b><br><i>Informational</i> (11:50 – 11:55 a.m.) – Pg. 199  | Anna McLaughlin    |
| <b>I. Local Issues</b>  | Group              |

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The next regular meeting of the STA SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium will be at **10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, February 23, 2005.**







**INTERCITY TRANSIT CONSORTIUM**  
**Minutes of the meeting of**  
**December 22, 2004**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium was called to order at approximately 10:02 a.m. in the Solano Transportation Authority Conference Room.

<b>Consortium Present:</b>	Robert Sousa	Benicia Transit
	Jeff Matheson	Dixon Rendi-Ride
	Nigel Browne	Fairfield/Suisun Transit
	Trent Fry	Vacaville City Coach
	John Harris	Vallejo Transit

<b>Also Present:</b>	Daryl Halls	STA
	Dan Christians	STA
	Mike Duncan	STA
	Elizabeth Richards	STA/SNCI
	Robert Guerrero	STA
	Sam Shelton	STA
	Jennifer Tongson	STA
	Johanna Masiclat	STA

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

On a motion by Robert Sousa, and a second by Nigel Browne, the SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium unanimously approved the agenda adding Agenda Item VII.E, FY04/05 Project Funding Adjustment.

**IV. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

None Presented.

## **V. REPORTS FROM CALTRANS, MTC, AND STA STAFF**

**Caltrans:** None presented.

**MTC:** None presented.

**STA:** Robert Guerrero distributed the Solano Transportation for Livable Plan (TLC) dated October 2004. He informed the Consortium that the Solano Countywide Pedestrian Plan (October 2004) and Solano Countywide Bicycle Plan (October 2004) will be distributed to the TAC members at the 1:30 p.m. meeting today.

Elizabeth Richards provided an update to the Unmet Transit Needs Process. She noted that MTC is currently reviewing comments received from the December 1, 2004 public hearing and feedback from MTC is expected in January 2005.

Sam Shelton distributed additional funding opportunity information on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5310 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Program.

## **VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

On a motion by John Harris, and a second by Trent Fry, the SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium unanimously approved the Consent Calendar.

### Recommendation:

- A. Minutes of the Consortium Meeting of September 29, 2004  
Recommendation: Approve minutes of September 29, 2004.
- B. Funding Opportunities Summary
- C. Updated STA Meeting Schedule for 2004

## **VII. ACTION ITEMS**

### **A. SR 12 Transit Corridor Study**

Dan Christians reviewed the major proposed tasks to be conducted as part of the SR 12 Transit Corridor Study. He announced that Urbitrans was unanimously selected by an interview panel to conduct the study which is expected to take six months to complete.

### Recommendation:

Recommend the STA Board approve the following:

1. Approve selection of a consultant to conduct the SR 12 Transit Corridor Study.
2. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a consultant contract to conduct the study based upon the proposal selected.

On a motion by John Harris, and a second by Trent Fry, the SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium unanimously approved the recommendation.

**B. T-PLUS Work Plan for 2005**

Robert Guerrero outlined the STA's proposed T-PLUS work plan for 2005. He identified key activities proposed in the new work plan such as awarding Countywide T-PLUS Planning Grants and working with member agencies to develop local TLC plans and projects.

Recommendation:

Recommend the STA Board approve the STA T-PLUS Work Plan for 2005.

On a motion Robert Sousa, and a second by Nigel Browne, the SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium unanimously approved the recommendation.

**C. STA, SolanoLinks, and SNCI Marketing Plan 2005 (Phase I)**

Elizabeth Richards outlined a multi-year marketing plan and amended Scope of Work with MIG for the STA and STA managed programs including SolanoLinks, Solano Paratransit, and SNCI. She noted the additional funding of \$84,000 for the amended Scope of Services is included in the approved FY2004-05 STA budget.

Recommendation:

Recommend the STA Board approve the following:

1. The proposed Marketing Plan Tasks (Phase I) for STA, SolanoLinks Transit, and SNCI as specified on Attachment A;
2. Amend the existing contract with MIG for an amount not to exceed \$84,000.

On a motion by John Harris, and a second by Robert Sousa, the SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium unanimously approved the recommendation.

**D. Adoption of STA's 2005 Legislative Priorities and Platform**

Daryl Halls reviewed the proposed draft of the STA's 2005 Legislative Priorities and Platform and the amended version that included recommended modifications from the STA TAC.

Recommendation:

Recommend the STA Board approve the Draft STA 2005 Legislative Priorities and Platform.

On a motion by Robert Sousa, and a second by Nigel Browne, the SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium unanimously approved the recommendation.

**E. FY04/05 Project Funding Adjustment**

Elizabeth Richards outlined two of the FY04/05 STAF “projects” that support the County’s Welfare to Work Transportation Plan and Dixon’s Community Based Transportation Plan.

City of Dixon’s Jeff Matheson noted that the City of Dixon’s Subsidized Taxi Program was approved to be funded by the LIFT program and that he recommends that project funding adjustment of \$10,000 of STAF funds be allocated to the City of Dixon for the implementation of a medical shuttle.

Recommendation:

Recommend the STA Board allocate \$10,000 of STAF funds to the City of Dixon to implement a medical shuttle.

On a motion by John Harris, and a second by Trent Fry, the SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium unanimously approved the recommendation. Jeff Matheson, City of Dixon, abstained on the vote.

**VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**A. Funding the Alternative Modes Element of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan**

Dan Christians presented the major fund sources available for funding projects in the Alternative Modes Element in Solano County. He noted the need to identify high priority projects and short term and long term funding strategies for these priority projects based on the project and program priorities identified in the updated CTP.

**B. Solano/Napa Multi-Modal Travel Demand Model (Phase 1)**

Dan Christians informed the Consortium that Joe Story of DKS Associates will present to STA TAC the basic validation numbers for the base year traffic model (year 2000) as well as the projected volumes for the new model at the scheduled TAC meeting today. He noted that the final model, including all technical data, is scheduled to be presented at the STA Board meeting on February 9, 2005.

**C. Update of Small UZA Payback Plan**

Mike Duncan informed the Consortium of the letter sent by MTC to Caltrans opposing the payback plan and proposing Caltrans to work directly with Santa Rosa City Bus to remedy the situation. He added that letters from the STA, NCTPA, Santa Clara VTA, and Vallejo Transit were also sent to Caltrans strongly opposing this proposed plan and to date have not heard back from Caltrans.

**D. Transportation Enhancement (TE) Programming**

Mike Duncan identified the programming methods and requirements of specific projects eligible for TE funding. He noted that early programming of specific projects for the \$1.629M in FY 2005-06 TE funds must commence in early 2005.

Mike announced that a special TAC meeting will be scheduled in January to begin identifying projects eligible for TE funding.

**E. Status of the 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**

Mike Duncan announced that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has made no plans for STIP allocations for new projects due to the State budget problems and the diversion of transportation funds to the General Fund.

**F. Low Income Flexible Transportation (LIFT) Grant Status**

Elizabeth Richards provided status to the five grant applications submitted by Solano sponsors for LIFT funding. She cited that MTC has approved full LIFT funding of \$38,000 for the City of Dixon's Subsidized Taxi Program. She added the four other Solano County grant applications were not recommended for funding by MTC.

**G. SNCI Monthly Issues**

Anna McLaughlin provided an update on transit schedules, Partnership's Regional Transit Marketing Committee (RTMC), Welfare to Work (Solano), and promotions.

**H. Local Issues**

John Harris, City of Vallejo, announced several vacancies at Vallejo Transit. In addition, he noted that negotiations for a new bus contractor are underway.

Nigel Browne, City of Fairfield, announced upcoming vacancies at Fairfield/Suisun Transit.

Trent Fry, City of Vacaville, announced the vacancy for transit coordinator is expected to be filled by February 2005.

Robert Sousa, City of Benicia, announced the Short Range Transit Plan will be available for review next month.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:10 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, January 26, 2005 at 10:00 a.m.** in the STA Conference Room.



DATE: November 10, 2004  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Kim Cassidy, Clerk of the Board  
RE: STA Meeting Schedule for First Quarter 2005

**Background:**

Attached is the STA schedule for meetings in the first quarter of 2005 that may be of interest to the Consortium. This schedule is an overview of the first quarter of 2005 calendar year.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

**Attachment:**

STA Meeting Schedule – First Quarter 2005



## STA BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE (For The Calendar Year 2005)

DATE	TIME	DESCRIPTION	LOCATION	CONFIRMED
Jan. 26	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
Jan. 26	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X
Jan. 27	9:00 a.m.	Arterials, Highways, Freeways Subcommittee	STA Conference Room	X
Jan. 31	9:00 a.m.	Transit Subcommittee	STA Conference Room	X
Feb. 9	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
Feb. 18	12:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Fairfield Com. Center	X
Feb. 23	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
Feb. 23	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X
March 9	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
March 18	12:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Fairfield Com. Center	X
March 30	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
March 30	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X



DATE: January 20, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant  
RE: Funding Opportunities Summary

The following funding opportunities will be available to STA member agencies during the next few months. Also attached are summary fact sheets for each program. Please distribute this information to appropriate departments within your jurisdiction.

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Application Available From</u>	<u>Application Due</u>
Countywide Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Planning Grant	Robert Guerrero, STA (707) 424-6075	<b>January 28, 2005</b>
Traffic Engineering Technical Assistance Program (TETAP)	Christina Atienza, MTC (510) 817-3221	<b>January 28, 2005</b>
Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grant	Mark Bertacchi, OTS (916) 262-0985	<b>January 31, 2005</b>
Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)	David Priebe, Caltrans (916) 653-0036	<b>February 1, 2005</b>
FTA 5310 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Program	Dana Lang, MTC (510) 464-7764	<b>February 25, 2005</b>
Transportation Enhancement (TE) Programming	Mike Duncan, STA (707) 424-6075	<b>Programming in March 2005</b>





---

***FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:***

**Countywide Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Planning Grant**

**Due January 28, 2005**

---

**TO:** SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
**FROM:** Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Countywide Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Planning Grant is intended to assist jurisdictions plan projects that are eligible for the program based on the STA's Countywide TLC Guidelines. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

**Eligible Project Sponsors:** Local governments, transportation agencies, and community-based nonprofit organizations (if partnered with local government) may receive funding.

**Program Description:** This program provides funding for TLC planning activities.

**Funding Available:** \$150,000 to \$200,000 target budget through 2006.  
The maximum grant per project is \$50,000 over two years.

**Eligible Projects:** Planning activities:

- Concept/Vision plans, Specific Area Plans
- Drawing and Design of streetscape/capital improvements
- Public Outreach / Community meetings/ Vision workshops

Planning projects must be complete by June 30, 2006.

**Further Details:** <http://www.solanolinks.com/programs2.html>

**STA Contact Person:** Robert Guerrero, Associate Planner, (707) 424-6075

---



---

*FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:*

**Traffic Engineering Technical Assistance  
Program (TETAP)**

Due 4:00pm, January 28, 2005

---

TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Traffic Engineering Technical Assistance Program is intended to assist jurisdictions plan projects that are eligible for the program. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

Eligible Project Sponsors: Bay Area government agencies involved with traffic or transit operations and safety.

Program Description: This is a grant for technical assistance from consultants hired by MTC for traffic engineering projects defined by local agencies.

Funding Available: Approximately \$225,000 in federal funds for 2005. Maximum grant amount per project is \$30,000 with MTC making the local match.

Eligible Projects: *Operations:* Traffic calming, crosswalks  
*Analysis/Evaluations:* collision analysis, develop grant applications  
*Planning:* challenging project planning (e.g. Traffic signal system upgrades, Smart Corridor operations.)

Further Details: <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tetap-cfp.htm>

Program Contact Person: Christina Atienza, MTC, (510) 817-3221

STA Contact Person: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant, (707) 424-6075

---



---

*FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:*

**Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grant**

Due January 31, 2005

---

TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grant is intended to assist jurisdictions plan projects that are eligible for the program. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

**Eligible Project Sponsors:** State governmental agencies, state colleges, and state universities, local city and county government agencies, school districts, fire departments, and public emergency services providers are eligible. Community-based organizations and nonprofits may be co-partners but cannot receive the funds

**Program Description:** OTS offers traffic safety grant funds to reduce deaths, injuries and economic losses resulting from traffic related collisions

**Funding Available:** OTS awarded \$74.2 million in FY 03/04.

**Example Projects:** Solano County 2005 Traffic Safety Grant Awards

- Fairfield, "Safe Passage", Lidar speed signs on Air Base \$61,500.00
- Fairfield Police Department, \$342,648.00
- Suisun City Police Department, \$90,000.00
- Vallejo Police Department, \$125,000.00

**Further Details:** <http://www.ots.ca.gov>

**Program Contact Person:** Mark Bertacchi, OTS, [mbertacchi@ots.ca.gov](mailto:mbertacchi@ots.ca.gov), (916) 262-0985

**STA Contact Person:** Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant, (707) 424-6075

---



---

*FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:*

**Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)**

Due February 1, 2005

---

TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Bicycle Transportation Account is intended to assist jurisdictions plan projects that are eligible for the program. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

Eligible Project Sponsors: Local agencies with an adopted Bicycle Transportation Plan are eligible.

Program Description: BTA helps cities and counties fund projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters.

Funding Available: 2005/2006 cycle will provide \$7.2 million with a maximum grant of \$1.8 million. There is a minimum local match of 10% that must come from sources other than the BTA.

Example Projects: 2004/2005 BTA funded projects:  
Suisun City - Central County Bikeway Gap Closure, \$593,000.  
  
Other funded projects range from Class I, II, & III bikeways and bicycle facilities.

Further Details: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/btaweb%20page.htm>

Program Contact Person: David Priebe, Caltrans, [David\\_Priebe@dot.ca.gov](mailto:David_Priebe@dot.ca.gov), (916) 653-0036

STA Contact Person: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant, (707) 424-6075

---



---

*FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:*

**Federal Transit Administration (FTA)  
5310 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Program**

Due February 25, 2005

---

TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5310 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Program is intended to assist jurisdictions plan projects that are eligible for the program. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

Eligible Project Sponsors:

- Private nonprofit corporations
- Public agencies:
  - where no private nonprofits are readily available to provide the proposed service
  - have been approved by the State of California to coordinate services for elderly persons and persons with disabilities.

Program Description: This program helps agencies purchase capital equipment for elderly and disabled transit services.

Funding Available: \$12 million was available in 2004/05 and at least that much should be available this cycle. Applicants may request up to \$500,000 in equipment per year. With the 20% match, a maximum of \$400,000 in federal funds available per applicant. Applicants may request up to \$160,000 per project and may submit several projects per year.

Example Projects: 2003/04 FTA 5310 funded project:  
Fairfield/Suisun Transit – Two Paratransit Buses - \$92,800 in federal funds.

Other example projects include vans, small buses, computers, software, and mobile radios.

Further Details: **STA Deadline – PCC Meeting on January 21, 2005**  
**Applicant projects must be reviewed by the PCC.**  
Application Workshop – January 25, 2005 at MTC.  
MTC will review draft applications if received by January 28, 2005.  
<http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/5310.htm>

Program Contact Person: Dana Lang, MTC, (510) 464-7764, [dlang@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:dlang@mtc.ca.gov)

STA Contact Person: Jennifer Tongson, Projects Assistant, (707) 424-6013

---



---

*FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:*

**Transportation Enhancement (TE) Programming**

Programming in March 2005

---

TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds is intended to assist jurisdictions in the project programming process. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

Program Description: This program helps agencies fund projects that enhance the intermodal transportation system.

Funding Available: \$1.629M in fiscal year 2005/2006.

Deadline Notes: **Project environmental studies must be initially complete by June 30, 2005.**  
Project documents are due to Caltrans by April 1, 2006.

Example Projects: There are twelve categories of eligible projects that range from bike/ped facilities and acquisition of historic sites to landscaping and highway runoff mitigation. Projects eligible for TE funding can be found in the recently completed Solano Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and the Solano County Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Plan.

Further Details: A special January TAC meeting has initially identified 20 projects eligible for TE funding. Final TE projects will be programmed in March 2005.

STA Contact Person: Mike Duncan, Director of Projects, (707) 424-6075

---



DATE: January 18, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Dan Christians, Assistant Executive Director/Director of Planning  
RE: Review of Draft Three Elements of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation 2030 Plan

**Background:**

The three updated elements of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) have been drafted and copies will be provided to the Consortium members at the meeting. Staff is planning to circulate the individual drafts of the elements to each of the three respective CTP committees for their input, then have the STA Board distribute all three elements for a 30-day review period by member agencies, interested partner agencies and the general public. Upon completion of the review period, staff will address and/or incorporate all comments received and prepare a Final Draft of the CTP for recommendation by the TAC and approval by the STA Board.

This month, the STA staff will be circulating an environmental checklist (per the California Environmental Quality Act) and submitting a Notice of Preparation of a Negative Declaration to the State Clearinghouse.

Three STA Board committees are providing policy input on each of the major CTP elements and are scheduled to meet to review the elements on the following dates:

- Arterials, Highways and Freeways – January 27, 2005, 9:00 a.m.
- Transit – January 31, 2005, 9:00 a.m.
- Alternative Modes – TBD

Members of the STA TAC and Consortium are encouraged to attend these committee meetings.

**Discussion:**

Presentations on funding each of the three CTP elements have been made at each of the last three TAC and STA Board meetings. Further refinements to the 2030 Funding Needs Summary have recently been made to reflect more recent data. The draft CTP identifies a total estimated funding need over the next 25 years for each of the three elements as follows:

<b><u>Mode</u></b>	<b><u>CTP Needs</u></b>
Arterials, Highways and Freeways	\$4,176.4 M
Transit	\$ 697.4 M
Alternative Modes	\$ 179.5 M
Local	\$ 140.0 M
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 5,193.3M</b>

With a currently anticipated \$1,410.8 M of federal state and local funds over the next 25 years, the total estimated funding shortfall for Solano County has been updated to \$3,782.5 M. This shortfall is staggering and reinforces the need to continue to prioritize short term needs to address the most critical problems first and to develop a range of new funding sources.

The new Napa Solano Travel Demand Model (see TAC agenda item V.I.B) shows greater and greater congestion levels throughout the county, particularly increasing between the years 2015 and 2030. The need for increased efforts to implement the various recommendations of the recently completed studies (i.e. I-80/680/780 Major Investment and Corridor Study, I-80/680/780 Transit Corridor Study, Senior and Disabled Transit Study and Transportation for Livable Communities Plan) will become more and more apparent to the residents in Solano County as the county continues to grow.

To provide for a high quality of life in Solano County now and in the future, it is important to ensure adequate maintenance of roads and facilities, improved travel safety, maintain and provide expanded transit and alternative modes of travel. The comprehensive strategy recommended in the updated CTP will need to be a high priority of the STA, its member agencies and partners for many years to come.

Staff is planning to discuss with the STA Board funding the three Draft CTP elements at their Board Retreat on February 17, 2005. Based on the discussion at that meeting and depending on other comments received, it is expected that the Final Draft CTP will be completed by STA staff on March 23, 2005. The review and recommendation by the TAC and Consortium is scheduled for March 31, 2005 and an action by the STA Board is planned for April 13, 2005.

**Recommendation:**

Recommend the STA Board release the three elements of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) update for a 30-day review and comment period.

**Attachment:**

- A. Draft three elements of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)  
(Update to be provided under separate cover).





DATE: January 18, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Robert Guerrero, Associate Planner  
RE: FY 2005-06 TFCA 40% Program Manager Guidelines and  
Call for Projects

**Background:**

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program annually provides funding to cities and counties within its jurisdiction for projects that reduce air pollution from motor vehicles such as clean air vehicle infrastructure, clean air vehicles, shuttle bus services, bicycle projects, and alternative modes promotional/ educational projects. Two air districts, the BAAQMD and the Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District, divides Solano County. The cities of Benicia, Fairfield, Suisun City, Vallejo, and southwestern portions of Solano County are located in the Bay Area Air Basin, and therefore are eligible to apply for these funds.

Funding for the TFCA program is provided by a \$4 vehicle registration fee collected from counties within the BAAQMD air basin. The BAAQMD distributes regionally, through a competitive process 60% of the entire TFCA funds, the remaining 40% are for TFCA Program Manager projects. Program Manager projects are reviewed and approved by the Congestion Management Agency (or other BAAQMD designated agency) from each county in the BAAQMD. The STA is designated the "Program Manager" of the 40% TFCA funding for Solano County and manages approximately \$340,000 in annual TFCA funding.

As the designated Program Manager, the STA Board adopts TFCA Program Manager Guidelines based on the annually updated BAAQMD's TFCA Regional and Program Manager Guidelines. The STA Board generally adopts the TFCA Program Manager Guidelines after the BAAQMD approves their set of guidelines in January of each year. The main difference between the STA's guidelines versus the BAAQMD's guidelines is that the STA guidelines pertains more directly to Solano County applicants by emphasizing the STA's program manager aspects of the BAAQMD's guidelines.

The BAAQMD TFCA application deadline has traditionally been in April of each year. Although Program Managers review and approve TFCA Program Manager Projects, the BAAQMD ultimately approves the funding for each project based on specific air emission/ air quality benefit cost effective formulas for each project category.

**Discussion:**

Attached is STA staff's proposed Solano TFCA 40% Program Manager Fund Guidelines which reflects Fiscal Year 2005/06 BAAQMD's adopted guidelines. The Solano TFCA Guidelines was improved to ensure consistency with the BAAQMD's adopted guidelines. The

proposed Solano TFCA 40% Program Manager Fund Guidelines have been reorganized to focus primarily on the types of projects eligible for the program and includes a detailed section for light and heavy-duty clean air vehicles.

Previous guidelines focused on the program manager application process and the required application information. The proposed guidelines briefly provides an overview of the application process, but does not discuss required application information as detailed as in previous guidelines. Instead, the required application information will be included in the Solano TFCA 40% Program Manager Fund application package which will be sent to STA's member agencies along with the approved Solano TFCA 40% Program Manager Fund Guidelines.

Staff is recommending the Consortium and TAC forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the proposed Solano TFCA 40% Program Manager Fund Guidelines and authorize the Executive Director to issue a call for TFCA 40% Program Manager Fund projects. The tentative schedule for the FY 2005/06 TFCA cycle is as follows:

- |  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. STA Board Approves TFCA Guidelines and Call for Projects.                       | Wednesday, February 9, 2005 |
| 2. Tentative Deadline for FY05/06 Applications                                     | Wednesday March 9, 2005     |
| 3. TAC and Consortium reviews and recommends applications for STA Board to approve | Wednesday, March 23, 2005   |
| 4. STA Board Approves TFCA Projects  | Wednesday, April 13, 2005   |

**Recommendation:**

Recommend the STA Board approve the following:

1. 2005-06 Solano TFCA 40% Program Manager Guidelines
2. Authorize the Executive Director to initiate a Call for Projects for the FY 2005-06 TFCA Program Manager funds.

Attachment:

- A. Proposed 2005-06 Solano TFCA 40% Program Manager Guidelines

**Solano  
Transportation for Clean Fund (TFCA)  
40% Program Manager Guidelines**

**2005-06**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	2
BASIC ELIGIBILITY .....	2
APPLICANT IN GOOD STANDING .....	4
INELIGIBLE PROJECTS .....	4
USE OF TFCA FUNDS .....	5
ELIGIBLE PROJECTS .....	5
1. Clean Air Vehicle (Cav) Projects .....	5
1.a. light duty clean air vehicles.....	6
1.b. heavy duty clean air vehicles .....	6
2. Shuttle/Feeder Bus Service Projects.....	8
3. Bicycle Projects .....	9
4. Arterial Management Projects .....	9
5. Smart Growth Projects.....	9

## Introduction

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program annually provides funding to cities and counties within its jurisdiction for projects that reduce air pollution from motor vehicles such as clean air vehicle infrastructure, clean air vehicles, shuttle bus services, bicycle projects, and alternative modes promotional/ educational projects. Two air districts, the BAAQMD and the Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District, divides Solano County. The cities of Benicia, Fairfield, Suisun City, Vallejo, and southwestern portions of Solano County are located in the Bay Area Air Basin, and therefore are eligible to apply for BAAQMD TFCA funds.

Funding for the TFCA Program Manager Funds are provided by a 40% proportion from a \$4 vehicle registration fee collected from counties within the BAAQMD air basin. The Solano Transportation Authority is designated the 'Program Manager' of the TFCA 40% Program Manager funding for Solano County and manages/administers approximately \$340,000 in annual TFCA funding.

### Available Funding:

Approximately \$340,000.

### Proposed Schedule:

2005-06 Applications Submitted to STA  
TAC Reviews and Recommend Applications  
STA Board Approves applications

**March 9th, 2005**  
**March 23rd, 2005**  
**April 13th, 2005**

### Example Project Types:

The following are eligible project types for TFCA funding subject to BAAQMD TFCA Program Manager criteria:

- Voluntary trip reduction programs or implementation of ridesharing programs.
- Purchase or lease of clean fuel buses for school districts and transit operators.
- Provision of low emission and/or high ridership feeder bus or shuttle service to rail, ferry stations and to airports.
- Implementation and maintenance of local arterial traffic management, including, but not limited to, signal timing, transit signal preemption, bus stop relocation and “smart streets.”
- Implementation of clean natural gas (CNG) and fuel cell demonstration projects.
- Clean air vehicles infrastructure projects for both fuel cell and CNG facilities.
- Implementation of bicycle facility improvement projects that are included in the adopted Solano Countywide Bicycle Plan or the Solano Congestion Management Program.
- Physical improvements that support “Smart Growth” projects which achieve motor vehicle emission reductions and implement Transportation Control

Measures (TCM) 19 (Pedestrian Improvements) or 20 (Traffic Calming) as listed in the BAAQMD's Clean Air Plan and 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan. Projects must be identified in an area-specific plan, redevelopment plan, traffic calming plan, bicycle plan, pedestrian plan, general plan, or other similar plan.

### General Evaluation Criteria

---

1. Priority will be given to applicants in good standing. Project sponsors who have failed to fulfill project monitoring and reporting requirement for any previously funded TFCA Program Manager Funds will not be considered for new funding for the current cycle, until such time that the unfulfilled obligations are met.
2. Priority will be given to those projects that have the highest amount of local or non-TFCA matching funds.
3. Priority will be given to those projects having regional or sub-regional benefit (e.g. projects benefiting two or more jurisdictions or transportation systems).
4. Priority will be given to projects that has the greatest benefit to the reduction of vehicle trips and net reduction of air quality emissions (see attached lists of applicable data needed to calculate this information).
5. Based on the data submitted, all projects must achieve an overall TFCA cost effectiveness of \$90,000 per ton of emissions calculated on a countywide aggregate basis.
6. All trip reduction or implementation of ridesharing programs must have clearly defined services including such activities as carpool matching, vanpool program support, direct employer services and a monitoring program to accurately identify number of trips reduced each fiscal year.
7. All transit coordination and information programs must directly support and implement the recommendations of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

### BASIC ELIGIBILITY

---

**Reduce Emissions:** A project must result in the reduction of motor vehicle emissions to be considered eligible for TFCA funds. Planning activities (e.g., feasibility studies) that are not directly related to the implementation of a specific project are not eligible for TFCA funds.

**TFCA Cost-Effectiveness and Minimum Score:** Annual expenditure plans for County Program Manager funds must achieve an aggregate TFCA cost-effectiveness of less than \$90,000 per ton. To calculate aggregate cost-effectiveness, total TFCA Program Manager

funds allocated in the annual county expenditure plan are divided by the combined lifetime emissions reductions estimate for projects in the expenditure plan. Only funds allocated to projects for which cost-effectiveness worksheets are required, are included in the aggregate cost-effectiveness calculation. The following are excluded in the calculation of aggregate TFCA cost-effectiveness: TFCA Program Manager administrative costs, alternative fuel infrastructure projects, light-duty clean air vehicles with a gross vehicle weight (GVW) of 10,000 pounds or less, and TFCA Program Manager funds allocated for the Regional Rideshareing Program.

**Viable Project:** Each project application should identify sufficient resources to accomplish the project.

**Responsible Public Agency:** TFCA funds may only be awarded to public agencies. These agencies must be responsible for the implementation of the project and have the authority and capability to complete the project.

**Non-Public Entities:** A public agency may apply for TFCA funds for clean air vehicles on behalf of a non-public entity when one or more of the following conditions are met:

- A. The non-public entity will use the vehicle(s) to provide, under permit or contract, an essential public service that would otherwise be provided directly by the public agency (e.g., refuse collection, street-cleaning, school bus service, paratransit services for senior or disabled people, etc.); or
- B. The non-public entity will use the vehicle(s) to provide to the general public, under permit or contract, transportation demand management services (e.g., vanpools, shuttles to transit stations, door-to-door airport shuttles, taxi services, etc.) or services that provide members of the public with an opportunity to use light-duty clean air vehicles eligible under guideline #19 to #22, e.g., through station car projects, car rental services, or car-sharing programs.

As a condition of receiving TFCA funds on behalf of a non-public entity, the public agency must provide a written, binding agreement that commits the non-public entity to operate the clean air vehicle(s) within the Solano County for the duration of the useful life of the vehicle(s). In those situations where multiple non-public entities are under contract or permit to provide the service described in a) or b) above, the public agency must provide a written policy that demonstrates that the vehicle incentive funds will be offered on an equitable basis to all of the non-public entities that are providing the service.

**Consistent with Existing Plans and Programs:** All projects must conform to the types of projects listed in the California Health and Safety Code Section 44241 and the transportation control measures and mobile source measures included in the Air District's applicable Clean Air Plan (CAP) or the Bay Area 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan, and, when applicable, with the appropriate Congestion Management Program.

**Readiness:** Projects will be considered for funding only if the project will commence in fiscal year 2005/6 or earlier. For purposes of this policy, commence means to order or accept delivery of vehicles or other equipment being purchased as part of the project, to begin delivery of the service or product provided by the project, or to award a construction contract.

**Maximum One Year Operating Costs:** For projects which request operating funds to provide a service, such as ridesharing programs and shuttle and feeder bus projects, the STA will provide funding on an annual basis: i.e., the STA will approve funding for one annual budget cycle. Applicants who seek TFCA Program Manager Funds for additional years must re-apply for funding in the subsequent funding cycle.

**Project Revisions:** For Program Manager Funds, project revisions must be reviewed and approved by the STA and the BAAQMD. The revised project must maintain an aggregate TFCA cost-effectiveness of less than \$90,000 per ton. Project revisions that result in higher aggregate cost-effectiveness for the year in which the project was originally approved will not be accepted.

### APPLICANT IN GOOD STANDING

---

**Monitoring and Reporting:** Project sponsors who have failed to fulfill monitoring and reporting requirements for any previously funded TFCA Regional Fund project will not be considered for new funding for the current funding cycle, and until such time as the unfulfilled obligations are met.

**Failed Audit:** Project sponsors who have failed either the fiscal audit or the performance audit for a prior TFCA project may, at the discretion of the BAAQMD Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO), be excluded from future funding. Existing funds already awarded to the agency will not be released until all audit recommendations and remedies have been implemented.

A failed fiscal audit means an uncorrected audit finding that confirms an ineligible expenditure of TFCA funds. A failed performance audit means that the project was not implemented as set forth in the project funding agreement.

**Implementation:** Project sponsors that have a signed Funding Agreement for a prior TFCA project, but have not yet implemented that project by the current application deadline, will not be considered for funding for any new project. The phrase "implemented that project" means that the project has moved beyond initial planning stages and the project is being implemented consistent with the implementations schedule specified in the project funding agreement.

### INELIGIBLE PROJECTS

---



**Duplication:** Applications for projects that duplicate existing projects, regardless of funding source, will not be considered for funding. Combining Program Manager Funds with TFCA Regional Funds for a single project is not project duplication. Applications requesting TFCA funding for project costs with duplicate funding sources will not be considered for funding.

**Employee Subsidy:** Projects that provide a direct or indirect financial transit or rideshare subsidy exclusively to employees of the project sponsor will not be considered for funding. For projects that provide such subsidies, the direct or indirect financial transit or rideshare subsidy must be available, in addition to the employees of the project sponsor, to employees other than those of the project sponsor.

## USE OF TFCA FUNDS

---

**Combined Funds:** TFCA County Program Manager Funds may be combined with TFCA Regional Funds for the funding of an eligible project. For purposes of calculating TFCA funding effectiveness for TFCA Regional Funds, the 40% County Program Manager Funds will be included in the calculation of the TFCA cost of the project. TFCA Regional Funds will not be included in calculating the aggregate cost-effectiveness of each County Program Manager annual TFCA expenditure plan.

**Cost of Developing Proposals:** The costs of developing proposals for TFCA funding are not eligible to be reimbursed with TFCA funds.

**Indirect Costs:** Indirect costs are not eligible for reimbursement with TFCA funds.

**Expend Funds within Two Years:** TFCA Program Manager Funds must be expended within two (2) years of receipt of the first transfer of funds from the Air District to the STA in the applicable fiscal year, unless a longer period is formally (i.e., in writing) approved in advance by the STA. The STA may approve no more than two (2) one (1)-year schedule extensions for a project. A third schedule extension for a project can only be given if written approval is received by the STA from the Air District.

## ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

---

### 1. CLEAN AIR VEHICLE (CAV) PROJECTS

Clean Air Vehicle Infrastructure: The TFCA may fund infrastructure to support natural gas vehicles and fuel cell vehicles. The infrastructure must be accessible, to the extent feasible, to other public agencies, private fleets, and the general public.

Clean Air Vehicle Weights: For TFCA purposes, light-duty vehicles are those 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight (GVW) or lighter. Heavy-duty vehicles are those 10,001 pounds GVW or heavier.

### **1.a. Light Duty Clean Air Vehicles**

**Light-Duty CAV Eligibility:** All light-duty chassis-certified vehicles certified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as meeting established super ultra low emission vehicle (SULEV), partial zero emission vehicle (PZEV), advanced technology-partial zero emission vehicle (AT-PZEV), or zero emission vehicle (ZEV) standards are eligible for TFCA funding. Gasoline and diesel vehicles are not eligible for TFCA funding. Hybrid-electric vehicles that meet the SULEV, PZEV, AT-PZEV, or ZEV standards are eligible for TFCA funding.

**Light-Duty CAV Available Funding:** For light-duty clean air vehicle projects for passenger cars, pick-up trucks, and vans, project sponsors may receive no more than the following funding incentive amounts:

<u>Emission Rating Vehicle Type</u>	<u>Incentive Amount</u>
SULEV Hybrid electric	\$2,000
SULEV Natural gas / propane	\$4,000
ZEV Highway battery electric	\$5,000
ZEV City battery electric	\$3,000
ZEV Neighborhood battery electric	\$1,000
ZEV 3-wheel battery electric	\$1,000

These incentive amounts above will be pro-rated for leased vehicles in those cases where the vehicle is available for purchase. The incentive amounts for partial zero emission vehicles (PZEV) and advanced technology-partial zero emission vehicles (AT-PZEV) are the same as for SULEV-rated vehicles.

### **1.b. Heavy Duty Clean Air Vehicles**

**New Heavy-Duty CAV Eligibility:** To be eligible for TFCA funding, the engines of all new heavy-duty vehicles must be certified to CARB's optional reduced-emission NO<sub>x</sub> plus non-methane hydrocarbon (NMHC) standard for 2004 (1.8 g/bhp-hr), or lower. Emission reductions for heavy-duty engine projects will be calculated by comparing the CARB certification level for the engine to the CARB emission standard or regulation that applies for the particular fleet or vehicle. To qualify for TFCA funding, the project must provide emission reductions beyond the requirements of the applicable CARB standard or regulation.

**Heavy-Duty CAV Available Funding:** For heavy-duty clean air vehicle projects, project sponsors may receive no more than the incremental cost of the new cleaner vehicle. Incremental cost is the difference in the purchase prices of the new clean air vehicle and its new diesel counterpart. However, public transit agencies, which have elected to pursue the "alternative fuel" path under CARB's urban transit bus regulation, may continue to apply for up to \$150,000 per alternative fuel transit bus (30 ft. or bigger).

**Heavy-Duty Vehicle Replacement Projects:** Sponsors of heavy-duty vehicles purchased with TFCA funds must either:

- A. Replace an existing similar or equivalent registered and operational diesel vehicle within the applicable vehicle fleet, or acquire and scrap an equivalent registered and operational vehicle from another fleet within the Bay Area. The vehicle being replaced must be removed from service and destroyed (i.e., destruction of the engine block and frame/chassis), or
- B. Add a diesel emission control strategy to an existing similar or equivalent registered and operational vehicle within the applicable vehicle fleet or within the fleet of the project sponsor. The control strategy must be certified or verified by CARB to reduce emissions and be approved by CARB for use with the relevant engine. This option requires the use of ultra-low-sulfur diesel.

Applicants may request TFCA funds, pursuant to guidelines developed by BAAQMD staff, to offset the cost of complying with this policy. If the applicant requests TFCA funds to cover these costs, the funds will be included in calculating the TFCA cost-effectiveness of the project application.

Note: a “registered and operational vehicle” is a vehicle that has been registered with the California Department of Vehicles as an operational vehicle within the jurisdiction of the Air District for at least the two (2) years prior to the application date.

Emissions Reducing Projects from Existing Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines:

Options available to reduce emissions from existing heavy-duty diesel engines include:

- A. Repowers – To be eligible for TFCA funding, the new engines selected to repower an existing heavy-duty vehicle must reduce NOx emissions by at least 15% compared to the existing engine that will be replaced.
- B. Diesel Emission Control Strategies – Diesel emission control strategies compatible with existing heavy-duty diesel engines are eligible for TFCA funding, subject to the conditions described below:
  - All control strategies must be certified or verified by CARB to reduce emissions and be approved by CARB for use with the relevant engine.
  - The use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (15 ppm sulfur, or less) is required in conjunction with all control strategies.
  - TFCA will fund, at most, the incremental cost (over what is standard or required by regulation) of the control strategy.
  - Diesel emission control strategies must meet the CARB standard of no more than 20% NO<sub>2</sub> slip, when the standard is put into effect and strategies are available that meet it.
  - The project sponsor must install the highest level (most effective) diesel emission control strategy that is verified by CARB for the specific engine and which can be used without jeopardizing the original engine warranty in effect at the time of application.

- C. Clean Fuels or Additives – Clean fuels or additives compatible with existing heavy-duty engines are eligible for TFCA funding, subject to the conditions described below:
- All clean fuels or additives must be certified or verified by CARB to reduce emissions and be approved by CARB for use with the relevant engine.
  - Ultra-low-sulfur diesel is not eligible for funding.
  - TFCA will fund, at most, the incremental cost (over what is standard or required by regulation) of the clean fuel or additive.

Bus Replacements: For purposes of transit and school bus replacement projects, a bus is any vehicle designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than fifteen (15) persons including the driver. A vehicle designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than ten (10) persons, including the driver, which is used to transport persons for compensation or profit, or is used by any nonprofit organization or group, is also a bus. A vanpool vehicle is not considered a bus.

## 2. SHUTTLE/FEEDER BUS SERVICE PROJECTS

Shuttle/Feeder Bus Service: Shuttle/feeder bus service projects are those requesting funds to operate a shuttle or feeder bus route. The route must go to or from a rail station, airport, or ferry terminal, and the project must:

- A. Be submitted by a public transit agency; or
- B. Be accompanied by documentation from the General Manager of the transit agency that provides service in the area of the proposed shuttle route, which demonstrates that the proposed shuttle service does not duplicate or conflict with existing transit agency revenue service.

All shuttle/feeder bus service to rail or ferry stations must be timed to meet the rail or ferry lines being served. Independent (non-transit agency) shuttle/feeder bus projects that received TFCA funding prior to FY 2002/03 and obtained a letter of support from all potentially affected transit agencies need not comply with “b” above unless funding is requested for a new or modified shuttle/feeder bus route.

All vehicles used in any shuttle/feeder bus service must meet the applicable CARB particulate matter (PM) standards for public transit fleets. For the purposes of TFCA funding, shuttle projects comply with these standards by using one of the following types of shuttle/feeder bus vehicles:

- A. An alternate fuel vehicle (CNG, LNG, propane, fuel cell);
- B. A hybrid-electric vehicle;
- C. A post-1994 diesel vehicle and a diesel emission control strategy certified or verified by CARB to reduce emissions and approved by CARB for use with the relevant engine (this option requires the use of ultra-low-sulfur diesel); or
- D. A post-1989 gasoline-fueled vehicle.

No other types of vehicles, except for those listed in a through d above, are eligible for funding as shuttle/feeder bus service projects.

### 3. BICYCLE PROJECTS

**Bicycle Projects:** Bicycle facility improvement projects that are included in the Solano Countywide Bicycle Plan or Congestion Management Program (CMP) are eligible to receive TFCA funds. Eligible bicycle projects are limited to the following types of bicycle improvement facilities for public use:

- A. New Class 1 bicycle paths;
- B. New Class 2 bicycle lanes (or widening of outside lanes to accommodate bicycles);
- C. New Class 3 bicycle routes;
- D. Bicycle racks, including bicycle racks on transit buses, trains, shuttle vehicles, and ferry vessels;
- E. Bicycle lockers;
- F. Attended bicycle storage facilities; and
- G. Development of a region-wide web-based bicycle trip planning system.

All bicycle facility improvement projects must, where applicable, be consistent with design standards published in Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual.

### 4. ARTERIAL MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

**Arterial Management:** Arterial management projects must specifically identify a given arterial segment and define what improvement(s) will be made to affect traffic flow on the identified arterial segment. Projects that provide routine maintenance (e.g., responding to citizen complaints about malfunctioning signal equipment) are not eligible to receive TFCA funding. Incident management projects are not eligible to receive TFCA funding.

Transit improvement projects are limited to transit bus priority and bus stop relocation projects. For signal timing projects, TFCA funds may only be used for arterial management projects where the affected arterial has an average daily traffic volume of 20,000 or more, or an average peak hour traffic volume of 2,000 or more.

### 5. SMART GROWTH PROJECTS

**Smart Growth/Traffic Calming:** Physical improvements that support development projects and/or calm traffic, resulting in the achievement of motor vehicle emission reductions, are eligible for TFCA funds subject to the following conditions:

- A. The development project and the physical improvements must be identified in an approved area-specific plan, redevelopment plan, general plan, bicycle plan, pedestrian plan, traffic calming plan, or other similar plan; and
- B. The project must implement one or more transportation control measures (TCMs) in the applicable Bay Area Clean Air Plan or Bay Area 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan. Projects that implement TCM 19 (pedestrian improvements) or TCM 20

(traffic calming) are encouraged. Projects that would implement other TCMs will also be considered for funding.

Traffic calming projects are limited to physical improvements that reduce vehicular speed by design. Improvements that rely only on driving behavior modification are not eligible for funding.



DATE: January 14, 2004  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Elizabeth Richards, SNCI Program Director  
RE: Rio Vista Transit Study

**Background:**

In the past two years, the Solano Transportation Authority has funded four local transit study efforts to facilitate enhanced coordination with countywide transit planning efforts. Benicia, Fairfield, Rio Vista, and Vallejo have all received STAF funding allocations to conduct local transit studies. In October 2002, the STA Board approved \$41,381 for the Rio Vista's Transit Study. This study is nearing completion and will be the first of the four to be completed.

Rio Vista operates a general public dial-a-ride service. One driver operates one vehicle that serves Rio Vista exclusively one day a week and travels to other cities the other days. Destinations are Fairfield/Vacaville, Lodi/Stockton, Antioch, and Walnut Grove/Isleton. The Rio Vista Transit Study had several purposes. These included:

- Maintain favorable community awareness
- Ensure compliance with laws and regulations
- Establish goals and procedures
- Analyze changing needs
- Recommend improvements

The City of Rio Vista hired Urbitrans to conduct the study which began in 2003. As there have been several critical staff changes at the City of Rio Vista over the course of this study, STA staff has extensively assisted the consultant and the city to keep this project moving. Members of the City Council have been involved as well.

A key component of this study was community involvement. The community's input was critical to identify the needs and perceptions of Rio Vista Transit. Stakeholder meetings, a public meeting, and a community survey were conducted.

**Discussion:**

The Rio Vista Transit Study began in 2003. Community outreach was conducted in the Fall and Winter of 2003/04. A wide range of individuals who had interests in Rio Vista and enhanced transit service were interviewed: the Mayor, city staff, local and county social services staff, senior housing and services staff, bus drivers, business organizations and others. A public input meeting was held with very good attendance. Surveys were distributed through social service organizations, employers, and other means. The surveys were designed to solicit opinions on the current service and needs, and future needs.

The consultant reviewed existing policies and procedures, conducted several interviews with Rio Vista staff, and collected as much data as was available. This was combined with the community input to prepare a draft final report.

The report includes a number of findings and recommendations. The key recommendations are:

- Clarify roles and responsibilities within the City for transit functions
- Shift dispatching function from driver to administrative staff
- Change days of service to various destinations
- Improve data collection
- Improve regulatory compliance
- Formalize transit policies
- Implement performance measurement system
- Expand funding sources
- Improve vehicle utilization
- Participants in the STA's SR 12 Transit Study and Transit Consolidation Study

The draft final report was presented at a City Council Study Session in early December. There was a very positive and healthy discussion to use the study to improve the transit service. Some of the study's recommendations have already been implemented by the City of Rio Vista. The Rio Vista City Council is scheduled to review and approve the study at their meeting of January 20. Implementation of many of the changes is projected to begin in February 2005.

**Recommendation:**

Forward to the STA Board the approval of the Rio Vista Transit Study.

Attachment:


A. Transit Study for the City of Rio Vista, Draft Final Report



# *Transit Study for the City of Rio Vista*

Final Report

U R B I T R A N **R** E P O R T



Submitted to:

City of Rio Vista

Submitted by:

Urbitran Associates, Inc.

January 2005

**Table of Contents**

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Overview of Rio Vista Transit .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1    Service Area.....	2
1.2    Service Description.....	3
1.3    Vehicle Fleet .....	5
1.4    Facilities.....	5
<b>CHAPTER 2 .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>State and Federal Compliance.....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1    Private Sector Participation.....	6
2.2    Buy America .....	6
2.3    Safety .....	6
2.4    Drug and Alcohol Requirements .....	6
2.5    Commercial Driver’s License (CDL), Certificates, and Endorsements .....	7
2.6    Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 .....	7
2.7    Disadvantaged Business Enterprise .....	7
2.8    Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 .....	8
2.9    Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO).....	8
2.10    Incidental Use of Vehicles .....	8
2.11    Transportation Development Act (TDA) Requirements.....	8
2.12    Non-TDA Requirements.....	9
<b>CHAPTER 3.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Operational Review .....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1    Operating Performance .....	10
3.1.1    Ridership Trends .....	10
3.1.2    Service Coverage & Trip Destinations.....	13
3.1.3    Trip Purpose .....	14
3.1.4    Passenger Convenience .....	14
3.2    Financial Performance .....	15
3.2.1    Revenues & Expenses .....	15
3.2.2    Farebox Recovery Ratio.....	19
3.3    Vehicle Utilization .....	20

<b>CHAPTER 4.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Performance Measurement System.....</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1    Service Effectiveness.....	21
4.1.1    Passenger Trips per Vehicle Mile .....	21
4.1.2    Passenger Trips per Vehicle Hour.....	22
4.2    Cost Efficiency.....	22
4.2.1    Cost per Vehicle Mile.....	22
4.2.2    Cost per Vehicle Hour.....	22
4.3    Cost Effectiveness.....	22
4.4    Vehicle Utilization .....	23
4.4.1    Annual Passengers per Vehicle .....	23
4.4.2    Annual Miles per Vehicle.....	23
4.5    Service Quality.....	23
4.5.1    Accessibility .....	23
4.5.2    Span of Service.....	24
4.5.3    Directness .....	24
4.5.4    Passenger Comfort/Satisfaction .....	24
4.5.5    Reliability .....	24
4.5.6    Safety.....	25
<b>CHAPTER 5.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Public Outreach &amp; Policy Review .....</b>	<b>26</b>
5.1    Public Outreach.....	26
5.1.1    Stakeholder Interviews .....	26
5.1.1.1    Attitudes and Perceptions.....	27
5.1.1.2    Unmet Transportation Needs .....	27
5.1.1.3    Recommended Service Improvements.....	28
5.1.2    Driver Meetings.....	29
5.1.3    Community Transit Survey .....	29
5.2    Functional Area Review .....	30
5.2.1    Leadership and Strategic Planning .....	30
5.2.2    Customer Service & Marketing.....	31
5.2.3    Human Resources.....	31
5.2.4    Employee Safety .....	32
5.2.5    Routing and Scheduling .....	32
5.2.6    On the Road Services .....	33
5.2.7    Maintenance, Vehicles and Equipment.....	33

<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Highlights from Related Studies and Services</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1 Related Transportation Studies	35
6.1.1 Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (May 2002)	35
6.1.2 Rio Vista General Plan 2001 – Circulation & Mobility (July 2002)	36
6.1.3 Senior and Disabled Study (March 2004)	37
6.1.4 Solano County Welfare to Work Transportation Plan (April 2002)	37
6.1.5 Highway 12 MIS TDM Elements (October 2001)	38
6.1.6 I-80/I-680/I-780 Transit Corridor Study (November 2003)	39
6.1.7 Planned Highway 12 Transit Study	39
6.2 Transportation Services	39
6.2.1 Transit and Paratransit Services	40
6.2.2 Intercity Transportation	41
6.2.3 Other	41
6.3 Summary	42
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>43</b>
7.1 Clarify Roles for Rio Vista Transit	43
7.2 Agency & Staff Responsibilities	44
7.3 Modify Service Schedule	45
7.4 Improve Data Collection	46
7.5 Improve Regulatory Compliance	47
7.6 Formalize Transit Policies	47
7.7 Implement Performance Measurement System	48
7.8 Expand Funding Sources	49
7.9 Improve Vehicle Utilization	50
7.10 Conclusion	51

## ***Tables & Figures***

Table 1-1 Rio Vista Transit Schedule and Fares .....	3
Table 1-2 Rio Vista Transit Vehicle Fleet Inventory.....	5
Table 3-1 Average Passengers per Day of the Week, FY 2003.....	20
Table 5-1 Stakeholders Interviewed .....	26
Table 6-1 Area Transit Services and Major Transfer Locations.....	40
Table 7-1 Roles and Responsibilities.....	44
Table 7-2 Proposed Schedule.....	46
Table 7-3 Performance Measures and Standards.....	49
Figure 1-1 Rio Vista Population, 1970 -2000 .....	2
Figure 1-2 Rio Vista Transit Service Area .....	4
Figure 3-1 Annual Passenger Trips, FY 1998 - 2003 .....	10
Figure 3-2 Monthly Passenger Trips, FY 2002 & FY 2003 .....	11
Figure 3-3 Passengers per Revenue Mile, FY 1998 - 2003 .....	12
Figure 3-4 Trip Destination, FY 2003 .....	13
Figure 3-5 Trip Purpose, FY 2003 .....	14
Figure 3-6 Trip Purpose by Destination, FY 2003 .....	15
Figure 3-7 Operating Revenues, FY 2002 & 2003 .....	16
Figure 3-8 Operating Expenses, FY 1998 – 2003.....	17
Figure 3-9 Operating Cost per Passenger Trip, FY 1998 - 2003 .....	18
Figure 3-10 Farebox Recovery Ratio, FY 1998 – 2003.....	19
Figure 7-1 Proposed Organizational Structure .....	44

## INTRODUCTION

Providing effective public transportation in a rural area is a challenge faced by communities across the country. It is particularly difficult because origins and destinations are often dispersed, institutions to support and promote the service are often undeveloped, and limited funding restricts how much service can be provided.

In spite of these challenges, the City of Rio Vista has offered its residents a valuable service in the form of Rio Vista Transit, a demand responsive, door-to-door transit service. While it has been a vital service for those who use it, Rio Vista also acknowledges the challenges it faces in providing transit service as the city grows. Therefore the city initiated this project to:

- Maintain the system's favorable community awareness,
- Ensure that the transit system is in full compliance with all applicable laws and regulations,
- Establish attainable goals and procedures to meet them, and
- Analyze the changing needs and environment of Rio Vista and recommend ways in which Rio Vista Transit can meet them.

To achieve these goals the city solicited the services of Urbitran Associates, a transportation planning and engineering firm, to complete a transit study. As such, the study is organized in the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1** describes how Rio Vista Transit currently operates – what the environment is like, how trips are scheduled and completed, and what facilities are used.
- **Chapter 2** presents the relevant state and federal laws which control how Rio Vista Transit operates and identifies where it is and is not compliant.
- **Chapter 3** evaluates the transit system's performance. Included are a review of ridership trends and trip characteristics, financial performance, and vehicle utilization.
- **Chapter 4** presents elements of a performance measurement system that will help Rio Vista Transit to monitor and evaluate its performance on an ongoing basis.
- **Chapter 5** explains the process and findings of the public outreach for the study and reviews existing policies for the transit system.
- **Chapter 6** introduces relevant findings from other transportation studies in the region that could impact how public transportation is provided in Rio Vista. This chapter also describes the range of other transportation services that are available to residents of Rio Vista.
- **Chapter 7** suggests recommendations that Rio Vista can implement to achieve the project's goals.

## CHAPTER 1


### OVERVIEW OF RIO VISTA TRANSIT

This chapter provides a brief overview of the transit services provided by the City of Rio Vista.

#### 1.1 Service Area

The City of Rio Vista is a community of 6,275 people (as of January 1, 2004)<sup>1</sup> in southeastern Solano County, along the Sacramento River delta. In spite of its small size, Rio Vista is the fastest growing community in Solano County and Solano County is one of the fastest growing counties in the Bay Area. As shown in Figure 1-1, Rio Vista's population was fairly stable around 3,100 residents between 1970 and 1990, but started to grow dramatically since then. For example, the city's population has already increased 37 percent since the 2000 census. A median household income of \$46,500<sup>2</sup> and moderate housing costs make Rio Vista an oasis of affordability in an increasingly expensive region. With 780 acres of land zoned for industrial development and another 70 acres for commercial development, Rio Vista is also ready to accommodate non-residential growth as well. Currently, employment is focused in manufacturing, construction and engineering, and the service industry.

Figure 1-1 Rio Vista Population, 1970 -2000



Source: CA Department of Finance

Located on the Sacramento River between San Francisco (45 miles away) and Sacramento (35 miles away), Rio Vista has served as an important gateway for goods and people traveling between the two cities since its founding in 1893. Locally, fishing has played an integral role in commerce and recreation, from providing fresh fish and canned salmon to San Francisco back in the time of the Gold Rush to hosting the popular Bass Festival every October. In addition to superb fishing opportunities, water-based recreation abounds on the delta and in Rio Vista.

<sup>1</sup> Source: California Department of Finance, "City/County Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change." ([www.dof.ca.gov](http://www.dof.ca.gov))

<sup>2</sup> Source: <http://www.riovista.org/econprofile.asp>

Rio Vista Transit provides service throughout the City of Rio Vista in addition to making trips to the communities of Fairfield, Vacaville, Antioch, Walnut Grove, Isleton, Lodi and Stockton. Many of these communities have transit service of their own, but they do not serve Rio Vista. Additional information on other transit systems in the region is presented in section 6.2. After a long period of relatively stable population, Rio Vista's current and projected population growth are expected to increase the demand for transit service.

## 1.2 Service Description


Rio Vista Transit currently operates general public demand responsive service during the week from approximately 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM using only one vehicle. City staff operates and administers the service. Rio Vista Transit provides service to different destinations throughout the course of the week, although all trips must originate from within the City of Rio Vista. Table 1-1 summarizes the services provided by Rio Vista Transit and their associated fares while Figure 1-2 depicts the service area.

**Table 1-1 Rio Vista Transit Schedule and Fares**

Day	City	Fare
Monday	Isleton/Antioch/Walnut Grove	\$2.00/\$5.00/\$5.00
Tuesday	Lodi/Stockton	\$6.00/\$7.00
Wednesday	In-city	\$1.00 + 25¢/stop
Thursday	Lodi/Stockton	\$6.00/\$7.00
Friday	Fairfield/Vacaville	\$6.00/\$7.00



Figure 1-2 Rio Vista Transit Service Area



How trips are provided on a daily basis varies somewhat on which city(ies) are being served and passenger needs. The general practice is that all Rio Vista passengers are collected in the morning and then dropped off at their destination. The driver waits in the destination city while the passengers attend to their business and then at a predetermined time, the driver recollects all of the passengers within the destination city and returns them to Rio Vista. Departure times to and from Rio Vista are chosen to best meet the needs of the majority of passengers and in most cases, a trip out of Rio Vista does not exceed five hours. On days when service is only planned for Rio Vista, trips times are much more flexible as the service functions more like a typical, demand responsive service.

Depending on the specific departure time from and return to Rio Vista, there may also be adequate time to complete local trips when it is requested. Often these local, Rio Vista trips will take place prior to picking up passengers for travel to another city, or after they have returned. It is less common to see the vehicle return from another city to complete a local trip and then return to the other city to pick up passengers. However, for closer locations such as Antioch, this is possible and happens occasionally. Regional *and* local trips are made on roughly 10% of the service days.

Currently Rio Vista Transit does not accept any subscription trips – that is, passengers must call to schedule each trip, even if the same trip is repeated regularly.

### 1.3 Vehicle Fleet

Rio Vista Transit's vehicle revenue fleet consists of three (3) vehicles: two (2) minibuses and one (1) van. Table 1-2 lists Rio Vista Transit's fleet roster.

**Table 1-2 Rio Vista Transit Vehicle Fleet Inventory**

Year Mfg.	Make/Model	Number of Seats	License	Fleet Status	Meet ADA requirements?	Mileage (6-27-03)
2001	Chevrolet Minibus	10	1101825	Active	Yes	25,207
1994	Ford Minibus	10	438761	Reserve	Yes	129,949
1986	Ford Van	8	069000	Obsolete	No	10,589

### 1.4 Facilities

Rio Vista Transit operates out of several different facilities. Vehicles are stored and serviced at the City Corporation Yard located at 789 Saint Francis Way. The transit system also has an office staffed by the transit operator at 35 Main Street. When the transit operator is not on the road, this office is utilized for scheduling transit trips. Lastly, the Director of Public Works and the Director of Finance, who oversee parts of the transit system, are located in City Hall at One Main Street.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **STATE AND FEDERAL COMPLIANCE**

This section provides a summary of Rio Vista Transit's compliance with relevant state and federal codes and regulations.

#### **2.1 Private Sector Participation**

*[49 U.S.C. 5323(a)(1)]: Subrecipients must ensure that private transportation companies have been given the maximum extent feasible opportunity to participate in the planning of FTA-funded projects.*

Rio Vista Transit has received FTA funding for capital expenses and the city of Rio Vista is currently developing a comprehensive purchasing policy. When procuring vehicles (through lease or purchase), Rio Vista must release a "Request for Proposals" and allow all interested private parties to submit proposals to provide the requested vehicles. During planning efforts, notices should be sent to private transportation providers giving them an opportunity to provide feedback on future plans.

#### **2.2 Buy America**

*[FTA regulations, 49 CFR Parts 660 and 661, and any amendments thereto]: Per Buy America law, Federal funds may not be obligated unless steel, iron and manufactured products used in FTA-funded projects are produced in the United States, unless a waiver has been granted by FTA.*

In compliance with the Buy America legislation, U.S. companies manufactured all Rio Vista Transit vehicles.

#### **2.3 Safety**

*[Section 5329 of the USC]: FTA may withhold further financial assistance from any recipient who fails to correct any condition which FTA believes "creates a serious hazard of death or injury.*

Rio Vista Transit maintains a relatively clean safety record and prioritizes preventive maintenance to ensure that the transit vehicles are always in good condition.

#### **2.4 Drug and Alcohol Requirements**

*[49 CFR Parts 29, 40, 653, 654]*

The City of Rio Vista has a drug-free workplace policy that was last updated in April of 2000.

## 2.5 Commercial Driver's License (CDL), Certificates, and Endorsements

*[49 CFR Part 383 and California Vehicle Code §12523.5, 15275, and 15278]: Federal regulations require all drivers of vehicles designed to transport more than 15 persons (including the driver) to have a Commercial Driver's License (CDL). California legislation requires drivers transporting more than ten (10) passengers (including the driver) to have a CDL. In addition, federal law requires a General Public Paratransit Vehicle Certificate (GPPV) for any person who drives a vehicle which carries not more than 24 persons including the driver and provides local transportation to the general public and a Passenger Transportation (PV) endorsement.*

Historically, Rio Vista Transit has not required the transit operator to have a CDL. However, this has changed recently as the transit system became aware of the DMV requirements. The GPPV certificate is issued through the California Highway Patrol (CHP) following fingerprinting and a criminal background check, while the passenger endorsement is issued by the California Department of Motor Vehicles after a review of the applicant's driving record and the applicant passing knowledge and skills tests. Currently, the city mechanic and back-up drivers have their CDL and the transit operator is in the process of applying for one. Of the three drivers, the backup drivers have the requisite GPPV certificate and PV endorsement and the regular operator is in the process of applying for them.

## 2.6 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990

*Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 provide that no entity shall discriminate against an individual with a disability in connection with the provision of service. The law sets forth specific requirements for vehicle and facility accessibility and the provision of service. Each public entity operating a fixed route system must provide paratransit or other special service to individuals with disabilities that is comparable to the level of service provided to individuals without disabilities who use the fixed route system.*

Rio Vista Transit does not provide fixed route service and is therefore not required to provide comparable service to persons with disabilities. However, the general public dial-a-ride service must be accessible to persons with disabilities. Rio Vista Transit vehicles are wheelchair accessible, but the transit system does not have a telecommunications device or a TDD telephone service for deaf persons.

## 2.7 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

*[49 CFR Part 23, as amended]*

The City of Rio Vista has a DBE program, although it is in need of updating for streets and roads contracts.

## **2.8 Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**

*The state and subrecipients must ensure that no person in the United States shall on the grounds of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, age or disability be excluded from participating in, denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any project, program, or activity funded in whole or in part through FTA programs.*

The City of Rio Vista's personnel department is responsible for ensuring full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The City has not had any civil rights complaints in the past year.

## **2.9 Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)**

*[Objectives are detailed in FTA Circular 4704.1]: FTA subrecipients must ensure that they comply with the following requirements of EEO: 1) to not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, age or handicap, 2) to take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed and that employees are treated during employment without regard to race, color, creed, national origin, sex or age, 3) to post in conspicuous places and make available to employees and applicants for employment notices setting forth an EEO policy.*

The City of Rio Vista does have EEO policy posted in the lunchroom at City Hall, although Rio Vista Transit does not always include an EEO statement when advertising open positions.

## **2.10 Incidental Use of Vehicles**

*[FTA C. 9040.1E]: Incidental use of Section 5311 funded vehicles for non-passenger transportation on an occasional or regular basis must not result in a reduction of service quality or availability of public transit service.*

The only non-passenger transport using the transit vehicles occurs on Thanksgiving and Christmas, which are holidays for the transit system.

## **2.11 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Requirements**

TDA contains a series of rules and regulations that apply to entities receiving Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) monies. Compliance with applicable provisions of TDA and the rules and regulations of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) [California CR Title 21, Chapter 3, Article 5.5, Section 6667] have been verified in audits of the City of Rio Vista's Transportation Fund. According to the audit, completed by Damore, Hamric & Schneider, Inc. (November 2002), Rio Vista was in compliance with the applicable statutes, rules, and regulations of TDA and the applicable allocation instructions and resolutions of MTC as of the end of fiscal year June 30, 2002.

## 2.12 Non-TDA Requirements

*[CA PUC Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 3, Section 99155, 99155.5]: California transit operators who offer reduced fares to seniors must also offer reduced fares to handicapped persons, disabled persons, and disabled veterans. In addition, operators must accept federal Medicare identification cards, senior citizen identification cards, and current identification cards for other transit operators as valid identification of the purposes of the reduced fare. Operators may not require that passengers be a resident of their service area in order to qualify for service.*

*Operators providing service to individuals with disabilities shall provide service without regard to whether a member of the potential passenger's household owns a motor vehicle or where they live and shall provide service on the same terms and cost that is provided to other persons residing within the service area of the provider.*

Rio Vista Transit does not offer reduced fares to seniors, which means that it does not need to comply with the regulations stipulated by PUC Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 3, Section 99155 (a) – (e). Rio Vista Transit complies with subsection (f) of this regulation, as it does not require that passengers be a resident of their service area. The system also complies with section 99155.5 because its service is accessible to persons with disabilities, regardless of whether they live in a household in which there is a motor vehicle and the service is provided on the same terms and at the same price as service to other persons residing in the service area.

*[CA Vehicle Code Division 2, Chapter 1 Article 3, Section 1808.1]: Employer Pull Notice (EPN) Program – employers of transit drivers must obtain a driver's current (within 30 days prior to employment) public record and then review, sign, date and store it. Employers must also participate in the pull notice system, which notifies the employer if a driver receives any convictions, accidents, license suspensions or other actions taken against the driving privilege or certificate of employed drivers. Employers shall obtain periodic reports from the DMV at least every six months, review the report to verify that each employee's driver's license has not been suspended or revoked, the employee's traffic violation point count, and whether the employee has been convicted of a violation of Section 23152 or 23153. After the review reports should be signed, dated, and maintained at the employer's principal place of business.*

Currently, Rio Vista Transit does participate in the EPN program and has copies of each driver's driving record in their office. The periodic reports are reviewed to confirm that each driver is still eligible to drive a general-purpose paratransit vehicle.

## CHAPTER 3

### OPERATIONAL REVIEW

This chapter reviews various aspects of Rio Vista's transit system, including information on its operating and financial performance.


#### 3.1 Operating Performance

Rio Vista Transit maintains daily passenger logs that track passenger names, fares paid, trip purpose, and trip destination. Although the data are not always complete, this information is useful to establish trends in ridership and trip characteristics. This section gives a general overview of the system's operating performance in the recent past and provides more specific information for Fiscal Year 2003 (July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003).

##### 3.1.1 Ridership Trends


As shown in Figure 3-1, ridership has generally been increasing over the past six years. Ridership peaked in FY 2002 with just over 1,800 passenger trips, but decreased significantly (30%) in FY 2003. In spite of this recent decrease, the trend in ridership remains positive. The drop in ridership in FY 2003 is consistent with the experiences of other transit agencies throughout the Bay Area and is likely the result of the struggling economy.

Figure 3-1 Annual Passenger Trips, FY 1998 - 2003



A cursory review of monthly ridership data shows the absence of seasonal trends. As illustrated by the “Average” ridership trend in Figure 3-2, monthly ridership is fairly constant throughout the year with the exception of a moderate peak in October.


**Figure 3-2 Monthly Passenger Trips, FY 2002 & FY 2003**





Because Rio Vista operates as a dial-a-ride service to regional destinations, it is also helpful to review data on the number of passengers per revenue-mile. This provides insight into system productivity and the effect of trip lengths. Overall Rio Vista's rates for passengers per revenue mile are quite low, reflecting low ridership levels and long trip lengths. Figure 3-3 shows how the metric of passengers per revenue mile has evolved over the past six years. The system experienced an increase in passengers per revenue mile in FY 2001 and 2002, reflecting the increase in ridership and an increase in the proportion of shorter trips.


**Figure 3-3 Passengers per Revenue Mile, FY 1998 - 2003**



### 3.1.2 Service Coverage & Trip Destinations

As cited in Chapter 1, Rio Vista Transit provides service to eight communities including Rio Vista. Evaluating where most passengers are traveling to and from will help Rio Vista determine if it is effectively matching the supply of transit service with the demand for it. Of course, it is also necessary to ask non-users where the transit system would need to go in order for them to use it. This information has been collected through the public outreach component of this study and will be discussed later in this report. Figure 3-4 shows what proportion of total trips were made to each destination in FY 2003. The most common destinations in the previous fiscal year were within Rio Vista (44%), to Lodi (30%), and to Fairfield (16%). Each of the remaining destinations garnered 5% or fewer of the year's trips.

**Figure 3-4 Trip Destinations, FY 2003**



According to discussions with the drivers and members of the public, there are existing difficulties regarding the demand for service to Fairfield. One issue is that Rio Vista Transit only provides service to Fairfield on Fridays. As the county seat, many social service and government offices are housed in Fairfield. Unfortunately, some of those offices, such as the social security office, are not open on Fridays, which makes it challenging for some Rio Vista residents to access these services. Drivers also relayed that increasing demand has resulted in them having to deny some trip requests to Fairfield.


Another complaint heard from the public was that service is not provided late enough in the afternoon. The service is supposed to continue until 4:30 PM, but passengers have indicated that service is sometimes terminated by 2:00 PM. This comment was heard from multiple sources and has been documented in other reports, such as the *Solano County Senior & Disabled Transit Study* (March 2004).

Finally, it is worth noting that the review of daily trip logs showed that trips within Rio Vista are provided on days other than those scheduled for local trips. This appears to be an informal policy of providing local trips whenever space and time is available.

### 3.1.3 Trip Purpose

Details on individuals' trip purpose were not always noted in the daily logs. However, the cases in which the trip purpose was given we have assumed those trip purposes to be representative of all trips. Based on this assumption, the most common trip purpose was for shopping which was given as the purpose for 59% of trips. As seen in Figure 3-5, "other" reasons were given for 21% of trips and the remaining 20% of trips were made for medical reasons. This distribution of trip purposes is indicative of the type of service currently provided by Rio Vista Transit.

**Figure 3-5 Trip Purpose, FY 2003**



### 3.1.4 Passenger Convenience


There are a variety of factors that contribute to passenger convenience, including: ease of making trip reservations, service schedule, and on-time performance. Currently passengers must make a trip reservation three days in advance. This is not particularly convenient for passengers. A more common policy among dial-a-ride providers is 24-hour advance notice. In addition to the need to schedule well in advance, no information is kept on whether passengers' desired pick-up times are being accommodated. Especially in cases of medical appointments, it is imperative that passengers be able to schedule their trip for a particular time of day.

As mentioned in section 3.1.2, the current schedule may not be meeting the needs of its passengers as well as it could. The best example of this is that certain services are closed on Fridays in Fairfield, but that is the only day that transit users can travel to Fairfield. Likewise, it is very possible that passengers would like to travel to cities on days other than those scheduled. Because there is no record of these requests, it is difficult to know if this is a serious issue for passengers.

In addition, Rio Vista Transit does not have any policies or data collected relating to on-time performance. Due to this fact it is impossible to determine whether passengers are being picked up within a reasonable timeframe. Adopting and following an on-time policy will allow passengers to have a higher degree of confidence in their ability to use transit for a particular trip. Often it is the uncertainty associated with travel times via transit that limits the number of people willing to use transit.

Finally, it is interesting to note how trip purpose varies for different destinations. Figure 3-6 illustrates the breakdown of trip purposes for the four most common destinations: Rio Vista, Lodi, Fairfield, and Antioch. Each destination has roughly the same proportion of shopping trips but the breakdown varies significantly according to the number of medical trips. Both Fairfield and Antioch have a high proportion of medical trips (around 45%), while Rio Vista and Lodi have more (30 - 40%) “other” trip purposes.

**Figure 3-6 Trip Purpose by Destination, FY 2003**



## 3.2 Financial Performance

In addition to reviewing information on the amount and characteristics of the service provided, it is essential to examine how much it costs to provide that service. The depressed regional economy and state budget crisis portend revenue reductions for the near future. In light of this, it is increasingly important to improve the efficiency of the existing transit service as much as possible.

### 3.2.1 Revenues & Expenses


Due to the size and relative simplicity of Rio Vista Transit, there is minimal information to discuss relative to revenues and expenses. The system’s revenue sources include California’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311, fare revenues and auxiliary transportation revenue from the city of Rio Vista. Although the specific source of Rio Vista’s contribution (the “auxiliary transportation revenue”) is unclear, it is likely the general fund. TDA Article 8 funds are used for both operating and capital costs while FTA Section 5311 is used

exclusively for capital expenses. Fare revenues and funding from Rio Vista offset transit's operating expenses.

As illustrated in Figure 3-7, operating revenues decreased slightly from FY 2002 to FY 2003 due to lower TDA funding, which is by far the largest revenue source for Rio Vista Transit. It is also worth noting that Rio Vista's contribution increased significantly in FY 2003 from \$989 to \$5,410 in order to maintain a 10% farebox recovery ratio for the year, which is the minimum requirement under TDA for rural transit systems. Fare revenue was fairly consistent between the two years.


TDA funds are generated from  $\frac{1}{4}$  ¢ of the state's sales tax, making them susceptible to fluctuations in the economy. To decrease its reliance on TDA funds, Rio Vista would be well served to apply for alternative funding sources, such as FTA Section 5311 Operating Assistance.

**Figure 3-7 Operating Revenues, FY 2002 & 2003**



Operating expenses include such items as the operators' salaries and benefits, administrative costs, maintenance, and insurance. Capital expenses include the purchase of new vehicles, which are funded in part by federal Section 5311 grants (80% of cost) and TDA Section 8 (20% local match). With the exception of FY 1999, Rio Vista Transit's operating expenses have increased every year. The largest increase in expenses occurred in FY 2001 when they escalated by 38%. The trend in operating costs for the past six fiscal years is shown in Figure 3-8 and illustrates increases of roughly \$5,000 each year. Over this time period, the service hours have remained the same and a single vehicle has been in operation at any given time. Consequently, the cost increases are not due to a significant increase in service. Therefore, the most likely explanation is an increase in the cost of labor to provide the service.


**Figure 3-8 Operating Expenses, FY 1998 – 2003**



Although detailed budget data for the past five years is not readily available, some level of detail was provided for FY 2002. In that year, roughly 73% of the transit system's expenses were generated from operations and maintenance. Another 18% was spent on administration and the remaining 9% were depreciation expenses.

On a per passenger basis, operating costs have been fairly constant until last year (see Figure 3-9). In the late 1990's the average operating cost per passenger was around \$36. This increased to almost \$40 in 2000 and 2001, but went back to \$36 in 2002 when ridership increased. Last year's drop in ridership coupled with relatively constant expenses led to a dramatic increase of 43% in the cost per passenger (\$52.38).


**Figure 3-9 Operating Cost per Passenger Trip, FY 1998 - 2003**



### 3.2.2 Farebox Recovery Ratio

The farebox recovery ratio (FRR) describes the portion of operating costs offset by passenger fares. Due to operating expenses rising faster than fare revenue, Rio Vista Transit is experiencing declining FRRs. As seen in Figure 3-10, the FRR peaked in 1999 at 11%, but has since decreased to 7% in 2003. Although this FRR would be considered quite low for most transit systems, it is a respectable rate given that it is demand responsive service. Rio Vista Transit is able to maintain this FRR because its fare structure charges relatively high rates for trips made outside of Rio Vista. These higher rates are for long-distance trips averaging twenty-five miles.

**Figure 3-10 Farebox Recovery Ratio, FY 1998 – 2003**



As was alluded to earlier, Rio Vista Transit must maintain a farebox recovery ratio of at least 10% each year in order to qualify for TDA funding. In years when the system does not attain a FRR of 10%, the city must allocate additional funds to the transit system such that the total of the fare revenue and auxiliary local funds divided by the operating costs is at least 10%. If the ridership and cost trends continue as they have in recent years, Rio Vista can expect to contribute increasing amounts to Rio Vista Transit.



### 3.3 Vehicle Utilization

As reported in section 1.3, Rio Vista Transit has two regular vehicles (minibuses) with one active and one in reserve. This means that at any given time no more than 50% of the system's vehicle resources are being utilized, which is not the most efficient use of those resources.

Through the review of the daily logs it is evident that there are days in which no, or very few, trips were scheduled – either because there is low demand to the scheduled destination or on the particular day of the week. This is illustrated by the data in Table 3-1 which shows that fewer passengers are carried on some days of the week than on others. For example, average ridership on Mondays, when trips are made in Rio Vista in the morning and to Walnut Grove, Isleton, and Antioch in the afternoon, is 2.1 passengers. This is considerably lower than the average 5.0 passengers per day which travel to Fairfield on Fridays. Low demand obviously results in poor vehicle utilization.

**Table 3-1 Average Passengers per Day of the Week, FY 2003**

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Destination(s)	Isleton / Antioch / Walnut Grove	Lodi / Stockton	Rio Vista	Lodi / Stockton	Fairfield / Vacaville
Passengers	99	174	469	199	238
# of Days	47	48	46	46	48
Passengers/Day	2.1	3.6	10.2	4.3	5.0

The average number of passengers per day is influenced by the demand for trips on given days and to given destinations and by the amount of time needed to complete the trips. Even when taking into account the trip destination, these rates suggest that there is unused capacity and underutilization of the vehicles. When trips are made outside of Rio Vista and the driver simply waits for a few hours before returning to Rio Vista with the passengers, this “down” time contributes to poor vehicle utilization. However, due to inconsistent data records, it is impossible to determine what percentage of the time is lost while the driver waits to make the return trip.

It is likely that there is some unmet demand for trips on days with low average ridership, but perhaps not to the scheduled destinations.

From passenger comments, it appears that trips may not be scheduled or provided throughout the published service span. If this is in fact the case, it would also lower the vehicle utilization rate.

## CHAPTER 4

### PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

This chapter proposes a system of performance measures that Rio Vista Transit can use to evaluate and monitor its performance over time. A standard is proposed for each performance measure, representing a benchmark that Rio Vista Transit should be able to achieve. It is recommended that performance standards be established for the following five areas:

- Service effectiveness,
- Cost efficiency,
- Cost effectiveness,
- Vehicle utilization, and
- Service quality.

The recommended performance standards presented below are preliminary and should be discussed further before being adopted by Rio Vista Transit.

#### 4.1 Service Effectiveness

Service effectiveness measures how much transit service was consumed or utilized in relation to the amount of service provided. The more service consumed of what was provided (vehicle miles and vehicle hours) the higher the service effectiveness. The main performance standards used to measure service effectiveness include passengers per vehicle service hour and passengers per vehicle service mile. Passengers are classified as the number of boarding passengers transported by the transit service.

##### 4.1.1 Passenger Trips per Vehicle Mile

The rate of passengers per vehicle mile is affected by local factors, such as the geographic size of the area being served and the intensity of land uses in the service area. Because of Rio Vista Transit's large service area and the relatively low intensity land uses, it is unrealistic to expect performance in this category to equal national averages.

The Transit Cooperative Research Program, Report 6, *Users' Manual for Assessing Service-Delivery Systems for Rural Passenger Transportation* published in 1995, established national norms for the performance of rural and small urban transit systems. For demand-responsive only services, the report identified a mean of 0.49 passengers per vehicle mile. The median was 0.33 passengers per mile, with a typical high of 0.92 and a typical low of 0.05 passengers per mile. Again, these are just rough guidelines that can be used to evaluate the service in the future and to help determine specific performance standards. It should be noted that Rio Vista Transit is on the low end of this scale, carrying just 0.08 passengers per revenue mile in FY 2003. As Rio Vista Transit adjusts its schedule to better match demand, it should be able to improve its service effectiveness with a goal of eventually matching the median value above. Due to the high proportion of trips made outside of Rio Vista, it is reasonable to expect that Rio Vista will continue to have a lower rate of passenger trips per vehicle mile than comparable rural systems. Therefore, it is recommended that Rio Vista Transit adopt a standard of 0.11 trips per vehicle mile which is modestly higher than its current performance, but still attainable.

#### **4.1.2 Passenger Trips per Vehicle Hour**

The most common performance indicator used to measure service effectiveness is passenger trips per vehicle hour. As reported in TCRP Report 6, demand-responsive transit services operating in rural environments had a median of 5.02 passengers per hour. The typical high was 8.94 passengers per hour and the typical low was 1.1. Unfortunately, Rio Vista Transit does not currently monitor the number of vehicle hours operated, which makes it challenging to evaluate the system's performance using this metric. However, if it were assumed that Rio Vista Transit provides an average of 6 revenue hours of service per weekday, then the system would have averaged 0.86 passenger trips per vehicle hour in FY 2003. Based upon this information and expected improvements, Rio Vista Transit should attempt to meet the typical low value of 1.1 passenger trips per vehicle hour.

### **4.2 Cost Efficiency**

Cost efficiency addresses how much public transportation service is provided (vehicle hours or vehicle miles) in relation to the resources expended (total operating costs). Performance indicators of cost efficiency include operating cost per vehicle service hour and operating cost per vehicle service mile.

#### **4.2.1 Cost per Vehicle Mile**

The mean cost per vehicle mile identified by TCRP Report 6 was \$2.14 and the median was \$1.69. The typical high identified was \$3.74 and the typical low was \$0.53. Based upon Rio Vista Transit's estimated operating costs and revenue miles for FY 2003, it had a cost per vehicle mile of \$4.23. An appropriate goal for Rio Vista is to achieve its average cost over the past five years which was \$3.60.

#### **4.2.2 Cost per Vehicle Hour**

The cost per vehicle hour performance indicator is a slightly better tool for measuring cost efficiency because the largest component of operating costs (driver wages and salaries) for Rio Vista Transit are paid by the hour. This performance measure assesses the cost efficiency of the system by dividing the system's operating costs by the number of hours the system's vehicle(s) are in service.

The mean and median costs per hour figures identified by TCRP Report 6 were \$25.80 and \$19.63, respectively. The typical high identified by the report was \$47.93 and the typical low was \$3.66. Again these statistics are for demand-responsive only services in rural and small urban locations. Based upon Rio Vista Transit's estimated operating costs and revenue hours for FY 2003, it had a cost per vehicle hour of \$45.02. An appropriate goal for Rio Vista is to achieve its average cost over the past five years, \$36.70 per vehicle hour.

### **4.3 Cost Effectiveness**

Cost effectiveness looks at the consumption of the transit service (passenger boardings or passenger trips) as compared to the resources used in providing the service (operating costs). Operating cost per passenger trip is the main performance indicator used in the industry to measure cost effectiveness.

Cost per passenger trip is equal to the system's operating costs divided by the total number of unlinked passenger trips. The mean cost per passenger trip identified in TCRP Report 6 was \$6.09.

The typical high reported was \$10.17 and the typical low was \$2.02. Based upon Rio Vista Transit's estimated operating costs and the actual number of passenger trips for FY 2003, it had a cost per passenger of \$52.38 last year. An appropriate goal for Rio Vista is to achieve a rate of \$41.00, which is the system average over the past five years.

#### **4.4 Vehicle Utilization**

As has been noted previously, Rio Vista Transit does not optimize the utilization of its vehicles. To be able to better monitor its performance in this area, it is recommended that Rio Vista Transit adopt the following two performance measures: annual passengers per vehicle and annual miles per vehicle.

##### **4.4.1 Annual Passengers per Vehicle**

Passengers per vehicle tracks vehicle utilization by determining the average number of passengers carried on system vehicles. Because Rio Vista Transit only uses one vehicle in service at a time, its vehicle utilization is quite low. In FY 2003, Rio Vista Transit averaged 650 passengers per vehicle. Rio Vista Transit should monitor its performance over the next six months to help set a realistic standard for this measure.

##### **4.4.2 Annual Miles per Vehicle**

Another performance measure, annual miles per vehicle, tracks how much the system's vehicles are being used. As noted above, because Rio Vista Transit only uses one vehicle in service at a time, its vehicle utilization is quite low. In FY 2003, Rio Vista Transit averaged 7,927 service miles per vehicle. Rio Vista Transit should monitor its performance over the next six months to help set a realistic standard for this measure.

#### **4.5 Service Quality**

In addition to the above performance measures, Rio Vista Transit should evaluate its ability to provide high quality service to its clients. Service quality involves the relationship between the delivery of service and customer expectations and demands. The quality of service can be broken down into the following attributes:

- Accessibility,
- Span of service,
- Directness,
- Passenger comfort/satisfaction,
- Reliability, and
- Safety.

##### **4.5.1 Accessibility**

Accessibility is defined as the ability of the transportation service to accommodate persons with disabilities on its vehicles. The most common accessibility performance measure is the percentage of vehicles that are lift equipped. Both of Rio Vista Transit's active vehicles are lift equipped. The transit system should maintain the standard of 100% accessibility to ensure that service is available to all residents. In order to achieve this standard all new vehicles must have wheelchair capacity and lifts. In addition, all drivers should be trained regarding compliance with the ADA including appropriate securement and sensitivity training.

#### **4.5.2 Span of Service**

Span of service is defined as the time during which service is operated. Rio Vista Transit currently operates between 8:30 AM and 4:30 PM, Monday to Friday. No service is provided on weekends or holidays. Given the level of demand within Rio Vista, this span of service is reasonable at this time. However, service should be available and provided during the entire span of service and not be limited by the driver's need to schedule trips or perform other tasks.

As development continues and demand increases, Rio Vista Transit should revisit this standard.

#### **4.5.3 Directness**

Directness refers to the time it takes to complete a trip via transit in comparison to the time it takes to complete a trip via a private automobile with no intermediate stops. Rio Vista Transit should try to schedule efficient trips that do not subject passengers to unreasonable travel times. In order to evaluate the system's performance, information must first be collected on the average travel time to each destination (city or town). The average trip length by car should be collected and updated at least once a year. Then a sample of passenger pick-up and drop-off times can be used to calculate an average trip time via transit which can then be compared to the travel time by car.

The suggested standard is that the travel time via transit should not exceed twice the time it would take to drive by car. This ratio reflects the point at which most people will no longer use transit instead of a private car. Because Rio Vista Transit serves multiple destinations, this metric should be evaluated separately for each destination.

#### **4.5.4 Passenger Comfort/Satisfaction**

Passenger comfort and satisfaction is often dependent upon many variables, including seat availability, climate control, and a smooth ride. The number of passenger complaints received is usually a good measure of overall passenger satisfaction. In order to track its performance, Rio Vista Transit needs to begin recording and filing passenger complaints. Rio Vista Transit should investigate all complaints and corrective actions should be taken.

Once Rio Vista Transit begins tracking complaints it can make an informed decision about what an appropriate standard would be. In general, the rate of complaints is tracked as the number of passenger complaints as a percentage of total boardings.

#### **4.5.5 Reliability**

Reliability can be tracked using on-time performance and trip denials as quantitative performance indicators. For a demand-responsive service such as Rio Vista Transit, a trip should be considered "on time" if the passenger is picked up within 15 minutes before or after the scheduled pick-up time. The standard for the system should be that 95% of trips are on time. These values are consistent with industry standards.

Tracking trip denials allows a system to evaluate how well the supply of transit service matches the demand for it. For example, if there are repeated trip denials to certain destinations Rio Vista Transit may decide to increase the times available for trips to that location. Rio Vista should evaluate its performance in this category for at least three months before setting a standard.

**4.5.6 Safety**

Passenger safety is also an important service quality issue. It can be measured several different ways to include the number of vehicle miles per accident or the number of passenger injuries per 100,000 passenger trips. Because Rio Vista Transit travels relatively long distances for small numbers of passengers, the mileage standard will likely be a more enlightening indicator. Either way, Rio Vista Transit should prioritize passenger safety in its daily operations and monitor its performance carefully towards achieving its chosen goal.

A standard of 80,000 vehicle miles between preventable accidents is appropriate for Rio Vista. This value is consistent with standards for other demand responsive operators in suburban and rural environments. Based on average mileage of 15,000 per year, this standard equates to less than one preventable crash every 5 years.

## CHAPTER 5

### PUBLIC OUTREACH & POLICY REVIEW

This chapter presents the results of two tasks:

- A series of public outreach efforts used to better understand the transportation needs of the Rio Vista community, and
- A review of the policies and practices currently utilized by Rio Vista with regards to its transit service.

#### 5.1 Public Outreach

Understanding the transportation needs of a community can be a very intensive process that is often best informed by multiple outreach efforts. For this project stakeholder interviews, meetings with the bus drivers, and a community survey were the primary methods used to collect the community's input on the role and importance of public transportation. These efforts, and our findings, are described in detail below.

##### 5.1.1 Stakeholder Interviews

As part of the study effort, interviews were conducted with key transit stakeholders, such as decision makers from the City of Rio Vista, city staff, and others involved with local social service agencies and employment centers. Table 5-1 lists the stakeholders who were interviewed.

**Table 5-1 Stakeholders Interviewed**

Name	Title	Organization
Thomas Bland	Director of Planning and Community Development	City of Rio Vista
Marci Coglianese	Mayor	City of Rio Vista
Adriana Bejarano and Zaida Mungaray	Administrative Assistant and Community Outreach	Rio Vista Care
Denise Rubiaco	Executive Director	Chamber of Commerce
Carol Hermismeyer	Director	Community Assistance Center
David Melilli	Director of Public Works	City of Rio Vista
Ava Williams	Program Specialist	Solano County Health and Social Services Department
Jan Rayl	Activities Director	Trilogy
Marc Bettencourt and Jeff Fernandez	Mechanic and Back Up Driver	City of Rio Vista

Some of those interviewed were quite familiar with the day-to-day operations of the city's transit system and were able to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of Rio Vista Transit. Others were far less knowledgeable regarding the transit system, but offered a valuable perspective on the social, political, and economic conditions of the area and on how Rio Vista Transit might be able to respond to changing trends in these areas. The result was a mixture of detailed and broad ranging discussion about the issues affecting transit provision in Rio Vista and its environs. This participation technique provided valuable perspectives, a context for framing the overall study objectives, and should prove

useful as preliminary recommendations are developed for Rio Vista Transit. The major themes gleaned from the stakeholder interview process are discussed below.

#### **5.1.1.1 Attitudes and Perceptions**

Stakeholders were asked about their general perceptions regarding transit services in the region. There was a surprising lack of knowledge among some stakeholders regarding Rio Vista Transit. Those individuals who were familiar with the transit system indicated that it has always been a fairly informal transportation service used by a limited sector of the population. Several people mentioned that the limited service provided by Rio Vista Transit makes it challenging for most residents to use. Furthermore, it was noted that many individuals in Rio Vista live on a limited or fixed income and the transit system is too expensive for them to use on a regular basis.

There was consensus among most stakeholders that Rio Vista Transit's current operation is extremely limited in scope and, as such, only provides a service that is of value to a finite group of individuals. Nonetheless, it was agreed that those who do rely on the transit system are greatly appreciative of the service and it is critical to their livelihood. Some stakeholders mentioned that they periodically receive complaints from Rio Vista Transit passengers about the service, however. Typical complaints relate to the hours of service, driver performance and/or courtesy, and system policies such as reservation requirements.

Another issue that came up in several stakeholder interviews was the lack of marketing by Rio Vista Transit. It was perceived as one of the system's biggest problems, particularly since many of the stakeholders themselves knew very little about the transit system. Recognizing that the transit system operates with limited resources, stakeholders volunteered to assist Rio Vista Transit with its marketing efforts. For instance, the Chamber of Commerce is willing to distribute and promote information on Rio Vista Transit.

#### **5.1.1.2 Unmet Transportation Needs**

During the interviews, stakeholders were asked if there are unmet transportation needs in Rio Vista. Most stakeholders noted that the private automobile is the dominant mode of transportation throughout the community. However, there are individuals who either cannot drive, prefer not to drive, or do not have access to an automobile and must seek other transportation options. For this sector of the population, the following issues were identified as unmet transportation needs:

- Insufficient service to Fairfield,
- Lack of service to BART,
- High level of service to medical facilities outside of Rio Vista,
- Later service to destinations outside of Rio Vista,
- Weekend service,
- Improved intra Rio Vista transit service,
- Service to Sacramento airport.



### 5.1.1.3 Recommended Service Improvements

Stakeholders were also asked about the future of transit services in Rio Vista and were encouraged to provide their long-term vision for how transit might operate five, ten or fifteen years from now. Some stakeholders did not have grandiose plans for future transit services and expected things to continue as is, while others presented fairly ambitious plans for improving service in Rio Vista and throughout the region. The following is a summary of the comments received.

One service concept that came up in several conversations was improved transportation for commuters. Commuters do not currently use the transit service because it does not meet their transportation needs. However, several individuals thought that there was demand for service between Rio Vista and surrounding cities, primarily for work-related trips. In order for this service to be a viable transportation option, interviewees emphasized that it must offer travel times that are competitive with the private automobile and it must be easy to use and schedule trips. It was suggested that commuter bus service be designed to provide one or two trips out of Rio Vista in the morning and one or two trips back in the evening. Potential destinations for this service include Fairfield, Antioch, Lodi/Stockton, and the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station.

Another topic that was raised multiple times was increased service to Trilogy, the age-restricted housing development on the edge of town. At present, there does not appear to be significant demand for transit service to or from Trilogy as most residents are able to drive everywhere they need to go. However, it is anticipated that this will change as the community ages and as Trilogy approaches build out. Currently, there are approximately 800 occupied units at Trilogy and plans call for 3,200 units at build out. Trilogy does not have any transportation plans for addressing these changing demographics. It is expected that much of the demand for transportation services will be to out-of-town medical facilities. A Trilogy representative indicated that many residents access medical services at the Kaiser facilities in Vallejo, Walnut Creek, and Sacramento. It should be noted that Rio Vista Transit does provide service to some Trilogy residents, but current demand is very limited. Several stakeholders indicated that demand for transit services to and from Trilogy will increase significantly in the next five to ten years and it would be beneficial to plan for this increased demand.

In addition to the increased demand for transit services from Trilogy, there are extensive development plans for the land between Trilogy and downtown Rio Vista adjacent to Highway 12. Rio Vista plans to build a wastewater facility in two years, which will allow other residential development projects to move forward. There are currently plans to construct 4,500 homes along Highway 12 over the next 20 years. Once these development projects have been completed, Rio Vista will be a very different community with new transportation issues and needs. Several stakeholders emphasized that the transit system must monitor these development projects and be prepared to offer additional services to meet the increasing transportation needs of the community.

The last comment regarding the future of transit services related to improving existing operations. While several project stakeholders thought that the service provided by Rio Vista Transit has been appropriate for meeting community transportation needs, it was generally accepted that the transit system needs to improve its overall operations to provide a higher level of service. As far as specific recommendations are concerned, interviewees proposed various operational changes ranging from better customer service to better vehicle utilization. For instance, it was proposed that Rio Vista

Transit use their spare vehicle for transporting children to school or child care, as children's transportation can be a particularly challenging issue for CalWorks clients who are seeking employment.

#### **5.1.2 Driver Meetings**

Informal meetings were held with both Rio Vista Transit drivers during a site visit on May 13, 2003. Driver meetings are very valuable as the drivers are often most familiar with customer concerns and day-to-day operations. The following is a summary of the comments received during these meetings:

- Regular requests from passengers for additional service to Fairfield,
- Passengers also request additional service within Rio Vista as there is only one day for intra-city travel,
- The transit system periodically receives trip requests from the Delta Loop/Tower Park community in San Joaquin County,
- Passengers also request improved connections to Fairfield-Suisun Transit and BART,
- Requests for additional service to destinations currently served,
- Rio Vista Transit would benefit from additional marketing efforts,
- Rio Vista Transit would benefit from having a no-show policy because time is wasted waiting for passengers or returning to pickup passengers,
- The transit system does not have a procedure in place for tracking trip denials at present,
- Demand for transit services fluctuates from week to week,
- City residents use the cab company (Delta Cab) in town from time to time,
- Most passengers are elderly and have been riding the transit system for some time,
- Passengers often express their gratitude for the service provided by Rio Vista Transit,
- One driver mentioned that the transit system implemented a fare increase eight years ago that was well received by the passengers,
- Drivers regularly check the oil and wash the vehicle, although more substantive maintenance is performed by the city's mechanic,
- Drivers complete daily inspection sheets to ensure that vehicles are well maintained and to identify issues that require attention.

#### **5.1.3 Community Transit Survey**

In conjunction with the Solano Transportation Authority, a brief survey about Rio Vista Transit was distributed in January 2004 (see the survey instrument in the appendix). The mail-back survey was sent to a wide range of persons and agencies including: city departments, social service agencies, and major employers. From this effort, thirty-six (36) completed surveys were returned. The following summarizes the findings from this survey:

- **Transit use** (34 valid responses) - 74% of the survey respondents do not ride Rio Vista Transit, 12% ride weekly, 6% ride a few times a month, 6% ride a few times a year, and only 3% ride daily.

- **Destinations** (23 valid responses) – the most popular destinations among those who ride Rio Vista Transit were Lodi (35%), Rio Vista (22%), Fairfield (22%) and Antioch (13%).
- **Trip purpose** – (16 valid responses) the most common reason for using Rio Vista Transit was for medical trips (44%), followed by shopping (38%), and “other” reasons (19%).
- **Improvements to entice non-riders to use Rio Vista Transit** (38 valid responses) – more frequent service to other cities (38%), more information about the existing service (22%), will not use transit (19%), more frequent service in Rio Vista (14%), and an easier trip reservation system (8%). For those respondents who wanted additional service out of town, the following locations were listed: Fairfield (listed 5 times), Lodi (5), Stockton (2), Vacaville (2), Antioch (2), Pittsburg (1), Sacramento (1), and San Francisco (1).
- **Age of respondents** – 71% were over 55 years old, 23% were between 36 and 55, and 6% were between 18 and 35.
- **General comments** – overall the survey respondents had very positive responses to the service and if anything, requested additional service. A couple of respondents commented on the lack (and need) for service to Trilogy.

## 5.2 Functional Area Review

This section reviews the functional areas of Rio Vista Transit, including leadership and strategic planning, customer service, human resources, employee development, employee safety, operations, routing and scheduling, on the road services, maintenance, vehicles and equipment, and federal compliance. A description Rio Vista Transit’s performance in each functional area is included.

### 5.2.1 Leadership and Strategic Planning

Rio Vista Transit is a small and relatively informal organization and the system’s institutional framework is reflective of this. As Rio Vista Transit grows, the system will want to develop a mission statement, clear goals and objectives, system by-laws, and an overall emphasis on teamwork to provide the best possible transit service to the community.

At present, Rio Vista Transit does not have any of the following:

- Mission statement
- Goals and objectives
- Performance measurement program
- System by-laws
- Coordination plan with neighboring transit systems

In the past, the City’s Finance Director has been responsible for the compilation of the system’s operating and financial statistics. This responsibility has recently been shifted to the Department of Public Works. As far as reporting requirements are concerned, Rio Vista Transit provides the City Council with their annual TDA claim and annual financial report each year.

### **5.2.2 Customer Service & Marketing**

Rio Vista Transit has not historically put much emphasis on customer service as their clientele has been relatively stable and the transit system has not prioritized expansion in its market or services offered. Following is a summary of Rio Vista Transit's performance in customer service.

As mentioned above, Rio Vista Transit does not target potential customers through any type of marketing campaign or distribution of materials. Unmet transit needs are determined annually at the regional level by the Solano Transportation Authority (STA). Rio Vista Transit does not conduct its own unmet needs hearings but it does provide customers with the opportunity to access information or file complaints verbally with the bus operator or by calling the Director of Finance. Complaints are handled in an informal fashion, on a case-by-case basis and actions are taken to address the complaint if possible. Rio Vista Transit does not keep a log of complaints received and it has never conducted a customer survey. Therefore, it has no other means of evaluating customer satisfaction aside from complaints received. It should be noted that the majority of complaints received pertain to the bus operator's driving skills or practices.

Passengers are encouraged to schedule their trips 24 hours in advance, although Rio Vista Transit will attempt to accommodate trips with less notice. If the transit operator is not available to take a client's phone call, they can leave a message on the system's answering machine with details of their desired trip.

Rio Vista Transit's sparse marketing program consists of a 1-page description of the transit system and the transit system's phone number and logo on the side of the transit vehicles. A "blue screen" text advertisement used to run periodically on cable channel 8. Aside from photocopies of their brochure and painting their vehicles, Rio Vista Transit does not spend any money on its marketing program. The transit system brochure is available at City Hall, the Transit Office and other locations stocked by the Solano Transportation Authority. The system does not receive brochure requests from other agencies or locations. There is no information on Rio Vista Transit on the City of Rio Vista website, although [www.511.org](http://www.511.org) does have limited information on the transit system.

The primary barrier to expanding Rio Vista Transit's marketing program is a general lack of support for system expansion. The transit system has additional capacity but it does not want to aggressively market the system such that demand exceeds capacity.

### **5.2.3 Human Resources**

With such a small staff, Rio Vista Transit has historically not prioritized employee development and training. For instance, Rio Vista Transit does not provide employees with special training or education to stay current with new technologies, industry practices or state or federal requirements. Following is a review of Rio Vista Transit's performance in the human resources functional area.

Rio Vista Transit does have a job description on file for the transit operator position. It aptly describes the basic responsibilities and functions of the position. With respect to qualifications for the position, the job description indicates that an individual with two years of transit related experience and the possession of a Class C California driver's license by the date of appointment is qualified for the

position. Recently Rio Vista Transit updated this requirement to include possession of a Class B California driver's license with the necessary passenger endorsements. Employees are responsible for keeping their Class B license and passenger endorsements current, as the City does not offer driver safety classes.

As with all City employees, Rio Vista Transit staff receives an annual review to evaluate performance. However, there are no interim evaluations or formal policies or procedures in place for motivating employees or encouraging staff to utilize their full potential. When hiring for a new position, Rio Vista Transit posted classified advertisements in the local newspapers, including the Rio Vista River News Herald and the Vacaville Reporter. Prior to hiring, the City of Rio Vista requires a medical report for the prospective candidate. Rio Vista Transit does not require more than one individual to conduct interviews of prospective candidates and the system does not use a standardized questionnaire/evaluation form to conduct the interviews.

Once hired, there is no formal orientation program for new hires. Rio Vista Transit relies upon the current transit operator to train a new hire. Rio Vista Transit applies Rio Vista's personnel policies to all employees. Applicable minimum wage, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements are posted in the lunchroom at City Hall. Rio Vista hosts an annual employee recognition dinner as well as a holiday party every winter.

#### **5.2.4 Employee Safety**

Rio Vista Transit does not have a safety committee responsible for setting the transit system's safety policy, nor does it have a system for ensuring compliance with OSHA laws and regulations. Rio Vista Transit relies on the city's emergency and fire prevention plan for all transit facilities and it maintains functional fire extinguishers, first aid kits and flares onboard all transit vehicles.

Rio Vista Transit provides blood borne pathogen training for transit operators on an annual basis.

#### **5.2.5 Routing and Scheduling**

As was mentioned above, the transit operator is responsible for all routing and scheduling duties. In addition to the main phone number, which is normally used for scheduling trips, the transit operator has a cell phone that can also be utilized for scheduling trips. When the transit operator is not in the office, passengers have the opportunity to leave a voicemail message with information regarding their trip request. Rio Vista Transit does not have formal "no show" or cancellation policies. The transit operator stated that they have returned 1-2 times to pick up a passenger when a "no show" has occurred.

Rio Vista Transit operators maintain a driver's log in which information pertaining to each passenger is recorded, such as passenger name, time picked up, date, destination,<sup>3</sup> type of trip (e.g., medical,

---

<sup>3</sup> Within the City of Rio Vista the destination can be an address or landmark. Outside of Rio Vista, the destination should be the destination city, at a minimum, but ideally it would include a major landmark or cross streets in addition to the city name.

shopping or other) and revenue collected. The following information is not recorded on the driver's log: address of passenger origin or destination, trip mileage or time, or drop off time.

The transit operator spends approximately 75% of her time on operational tasks (e.g., driving, cleaning vehicle, etc.) and the remaining 25% of her time completing administrative duties, such as scheduling future trips and completing requisite paperwork.

While Rio Vista Transit indicated that they want to meet existing demand for transit service, stakeholder interviews revealed that there is not much political support to fund service expansion at this time. Nonetheless, Rio Vista Transit does appear amenable to considering potential service expansion if demand is identified for such service. Furthermore, Rio Vista Transit conceded that they do periodically receive trip requests that they are unable to serve.

#### **5.2.6 On the Road Services**

Rio Vista Transit does not distinguish between accidents or incidents, nor does the system have accident or incident forms. Transit operators will assist passengers with boarding or disembarking the vehicle, including those passengers needing assistance with the wheelchair lift. Rio Vista Transit does not have an aides/attendant policy and transit operators are not prohibited from providing any type of assistance to passengers. The transit system does not have a formal policy for passenger behavior.

Rio Vista Transit allows the transport of parcels onboard system vehicles and does not have a policy for the transport of animals. Rio Vista Transit does not utilize their vehicles for meal delivery, except on Thanksgiving and Christmas when the Chamber of Commerce and the Community Assistance Center delivers meal baskets with the vehicles.

#### **5.2.7 Maintenance, Vehicles and Equipment**

Rio Vista Transit does not have a written vehicle maintenance plan; however, the system does have specific guidelines that are followed in maintaining all system vehicles. For instance, all vehicles receive a 30-day inspection and checkup and vehicles are serviced (e.g., oil change, filters, lube, etc.) every 3,000 miles. The city mechanic performs the vast majority of all maintenance work and generally follows the vehicle manufacturer's guidelines for the completion of all work. The transit operator completes a daily vehicle inspection form that is turned into the city mechanic at the end of each day. Most operational problems are either identified through the completion of vehicle inspection forms or during regularly scheduled vehicle checkups. In general, the newest van is used for making trips unless it is being serviced.

According to the drivers and vehicle mechanic, the wheelchair lifts on the Rio Vista Transit vehicles do not receive much use and as a result, do not have many problems or require much maintenance. All vehicles are stored and fueled at the city's corporation yard. The transit operator is responsible for the cleaning of the vehicle interior and the city mechanic is responsible for keeping the vehicle exterior clean. The city mechanic does not maintain an extensive list of parts at the corporation yard but is able to order most vehicle parts via 24-hour delivery. Vehicles are stored inside a locked chain link fence at night and on weekends and the system has not had any theft, vandalism or other security related problems.

According to the city mechanic, Rio Vista Transit has not had any serious accidents within the past two to three years. The transit system does not maintain a record of road calls. In the event of a vehicle breakdown or other incident, the transit operator calls the city mechanic who drives the spare transit vehicle to the breakdown location to relieve the transit operator of the disabled vehicle. The city mechanic generally has the vehicle towed back to the corporation yard to complete necessary repairs. The city mechanic indicated that this has only occurred once in the past year.

## CHAPTER 6

### HIGHLIGHTS FROM RELATED STUDIES AND SERVICES

This chapter summarizes key findings from other transportation studies and services that may impact or provide supplemental information on how transit is provided to residents of Rio Vista.

#### 6.1 Related Transportation Studies

The following descriptions highlight those sections of relevant transportation plans that could influence when or how transit service is provided in Rio Vista. Additional detail can be found in the original text of each study.

##### 6.1.1 Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (May 2002)

###### Purpose

The comprehensive transportation plan was developed to identify a future transportation vision for Solano County and will be updated by Fall 2004. Community input helped identify transportation needs that were then associated with various modes and prioritized. Then these priorities were evaluated to determine if existing funding sources could address these needs, if not, potential revenue options were identified. The plan was split into three elements – 1) transit, 2) arterials, highways and freeways, and 3) alternative modes. The review of this plan focused on the transit element – which would have the most impact on transit service for Rio Vista.

###### Relevant Conclusions

As part of the needs analysis conducted for the plan, the following needs were identified for Rio Vista:

- Construct ferry dock, and
- Fixed intercity routes to BART and rail.

The bus service plan recommended a series of intercity bus transit routes for implementation. Only those routes providing direct service to Rio Vista are included here, although improved regional mobility through transit centers in Fairfield and Suisun will benefit Rio Vista as well.

- **Route 12B** would establish a new link between Rio Vista and Fairfield and Suisun via Highway 12. Implementation of this service is included in the first phase system, which can be funded if all local TDA funds are dedicated to transit.
- **Route 12C** would establish a new link between Rio Vista and Lodi via Highway 12. Implementation of this service is included in the third phase system, which can be funded if all local TDA funds are dedicated to transit and an additional \$2 million is provided.
- **Route 12D** would establish a new link between Rio Vista and Antioch via Highway 160. Implementation of this service is only included in the unconstrained plan – which would require a significant influx of additional funding.



Another component of the plan's transit element was a discussion of the intercity transit support system, including park and ride facilities and intermodal transit stations. The following park and ride locations are recommended for Rio Vista:

- Highway 12 and Church Street and
- Downtown near Main Street.

#### **6.1.2 Rio Vista General Plan 2001 – Circulation & Mobility (July 2002)**

##### **Purpose**

The circulation and mobility element of Rio Vista's general plan outlines the city's plans for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods through and around the community.

##### **Relevant Conclusions**

Goals from the plan for transit include the following:

- The City shall ensure that a mix of uses and intensities are programmed for areas within  $\frac{1}{4}$  - to  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile radii of logical future transit routes and commercial activity centers. Park and Ride lots will be located where convenient and accessible; most likely adjacent to Highway 12 within the Neighborhood Core District.
- The City shall ensure that the physical design of new development projects facilitates transit use.
- As population growth and circumstances warrant, the City shall provide reliable bus service to Rio Vista residents. The City shall continue to provide the current service to destinations within and outside Rio Vista.
- The City shall support improved access to public transportation by people with impaired mobility.
- Where needed, the City shall supplement the future public transit system with continued availability of paratransit services.
- The City shall encourage private taxi service in Rio Vista.
- The City shall encourage innovative methods of running shuttle services within Rio Vista as needed.
- The City shall actively support the plans of transit service providers to increase service frequency and hours of service. The Solano Transportation Authority's Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Transit Element, is incorporated by reference into the Rio Vista Circulation and Mobility Element.

### 6.1.3 Senior and Disabled Transit Study (June 2004)

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of the study was to identify the transportation barriers faced by seniors and persons with disabilities and then to develop strategies to overcome these barriers. Transportation barriers were identified through a series of focus groups and a mail back survey.

#### **Relevant Conclusions**

The following strategies were specifically recommended for implementation in Rio Vista:

- **Short-term Strategies** included establishing procedures for same day medical return trips, changing the scheduled day for service to Fairfield.
- **Medium-term Strategies** included implementing a shopping shuttle and providing travel training for older adults.
- **Long-term Strategy** was to provide service from Rio Vista to the Pittsburg BART station.

### 6.1.4 Solano County Welfare to Work Transportation Plan (April 2002)

#### **Purpose**

The goal of this study was to identify strategies for improving transportation options available to Cal Works clients and other low-income individuals in Solano County. The plan was developed while working closely with an advisory committee to summarize existing transportation resources in the county, identify and prioritize transportation gaps and barriers, and develop solutions and identify potential funding sources to address those gaps and barriers.

#### **Relevant Conclusions**

The following are brief descriptions of those programs recommended for implementation in Rio Vista:

- **Morning and Evening Service between Rio Vista and Westfield Shopping Town-Solano or the Fairfield Transportation Center** is seen as a way to improve commute options for Cal WORKS clients who reside in Rio Vista and are seeking pre-employment services and employment outside the city. This strategy is being pursued. The city of Rio Vista, jointly with the County of Solano and the Solano Transportation Authority, secured a Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Low Income Flexible Transportation (LIFT) grant to implement a three-year commuter vanpool program. The contract between MTC and the City of Rio Vista was executed in FY03/04. The project would be jointly implemented among the three agencies with the Solano Transportation Authority's Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) program taking the lead. The vehicles are expected to be secured and service to begin by the end of 2004.

The project funds two commuter vanpools that would leave Rio Vista each morning and travel to Fairfield. One is planned to be an earlier trip serving transit transfer locations such as Solano Mall (local Fairfield/Suisun Transit routes) and Fairfield Transportation Center (inter-city transit services). The other vanpool is planned to travel later in the

morning and return earlier in the afternoon to transport Cal WORKS clients to the Ready Center in northeast Fairfield so that they can access pre-employment services.

The primary cost of this program is to cover the cost of leasing commuter vanpools from a third-party vendor. As the vanpool driver would be someone traveling to work, the driver is unpaid as is typical of a commuter vanpool. The cost of the vehicle lease, gas, and other incidentals would be shared by the County of Solano, City of Rio Vista, and MTC's LIFT grant. The County's Transportation Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds would pay for the vanpool fare for the Cal WORKS clients. Unfilled seats would be paid for by the City of Rio Vista's Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds and the LIFT grant. Because of the grant funding, the first priority for these vanpools is to serve Cal WORKS clients. If there is capacity remaining, the general public may be able to use the service at their own cost. This project's cost is approximately \$35,000 annually.

- **Volunteer Driver Program** was suggested to address the lack of transportation from Rio Vista to the rest of Solano County. This service would rely on volunteers from the general public to provide "non-regular" rides to SolanoWORKS participants who do not have access to transportation. Eligible trips might include those for medical appointments, shopping, or job interviews. The Plan suggested that the City of Rio Vista could be the lead agency in implementing this service while the STA's Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) program Solano County Health and Social Services (SCHSS) would provide technical assistance help quantify expected demand, and promote the service to SolanoWORKS participants.

Subsequent to the study making this recommendation, the Rio Vista Community Action Council (CAC) has begun planning to develop a more comprehensive volunteer driver program that would be inclusive of Cal WORKS clients. The Plan is estimated this project to cost approximately \$35,200 annually.

#### 6.1.5 Highway 12 MIS TDM Elements (October 2001)

##### **Purpose**

This report explores a number of alternatives to maintain desired level of service (LOS) ratings on Highway 12. The LOS on the highway is expected to be reduced by anticipated growth around the Highway 12 corridor.

##### **Relevant Conclusions**

The report developed five build and one no-build alternative to address the expected traffic volumes. One of these alternatives, Alternative Package 2 – Transportation Demand Management, if implemented would impact the level of transit service in Rio Vista. The following are the projects included in this alternative:

- **Carpooling Program – Park and Ride Lot Construction** consists of constructing two park-and-ride lots to facilitate carpooling – one of which would be in Rio Vista. The lot would be visible from Highway 12 and built so that it could expand as needed to accommodate growing demand. An advertising campaign would promote the park-and-ride lots, benefits of carpooling, and the ride-matching services provided by the Solano Transportation Authority (STA).

- **Local Shuttle Program** would connect the retirement communities on the east end of the corridor (Trilogy) with the commercial and medical facilities in Suisun City, Fairfield, and Rio Vista. The service would run on one-hour headways initially and coordinate with existing transit service in Sacramento and San Joaquin counties.
- **Transit Service** would consist of a new SolanoLinks route traveling from Fairfield to Suisun City to Rio Vista along Highway 12. Important transfer points would be at the Capitol Corridor Station (Suisun City) and the Fairfield Transportation Center. This route would also run on one-hour headways initially.

#### **6.1.6 I-80/I-680/I-780 Transit Corridor Study (July 2004)**

##### **Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to successfully implement the Intercity Bus Element from the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan through the development of detailed transit improvements along the corridor defined by I-80, I-680, and I-780.

##### **Relevant Conclusions**

Although Rio Vista does not sit in the I-80, I-680, and I-780 corridor, it would benefit from circulation and transit service improvements around Suisun and Fairfield. In particular, improvements that would benefit Rio Vista residents include:

- **Super express service** from the Vallejo Ferry Terminal to Sacramento, which would serve the Fairfield Transportation Center.
- **Expanded Route 40 (FST) midday service** would improve north-south accessibility during off-peak hours.
- **Increased frequency along I-80** would improve north-south accessibility during peak hours.
- **Fairfield Transportation Center access improvements** will improve the flow of transit vehicles around the center.

#### **6.1.7 Planned State Route 12 Transit Study (2004-05)**

The State Route 12 Transit Study is an upcoming study that will examine long-term demand for transit along the Highway 12 corridor. Though the scope has yet to be finalized, the extent of the corridor could extend from Lodi (San Joaquin County), through Rio Vista (Solano County), and all the way to Napa (Napa County). After estimating the expected transit demand, phased service recommendations and their anticipated costs will be developed to help local and regional transportation officials plan for their implementation. This study will be completed by the STA during 2004-05 with oversight provided by a steering committee with a representative from Rio Vista as well as the other communities along the corridor.

## **6.2 Transportation Services**

There are a variety of regional transit and transportation services available to residents of Rio Vista. The text below summarizes how residents might access these services, the level of service provided, and basic fare information.

### 6.2.1 Transit and Paratransit Services

Although Rio Vista is isolated from other communities, many of its closest neighbors have fixed-route transit service (see map of Rio Vista Transit's service area in Chapter 1). Table 6-1 lists these cities and identifies important transfer facilities or access point to their transit system. Likely due to Rio Vista's small population and resulting low transit demand, none of the adjacent systems have documented plans to provide new service to Rio Vista. However, Fairfield-Suisun Transit has expressed a willingness to serve Rio Vista in the future if the service were funded through a cost-sharing agreement with Rio Vista.

**Table 6-1 Area Transit Services and Major Transfer Locations**

<b>Community - Transit System</b>	<b>Major Transfer Locations</b>
Fairfield – Fairfield-Suisun Transit	Fairfield Transportation Center Westfield Shoppingtown Solano Suisun/Fairfield Train Station
Vallejo - Vallejo Transit	Solano Mall York and Marin Serenio Transit Center El Cerrito del Norte BART Station
Galt – South Sacramento County Transit – SCT/Link	City Hall, Galt Florin Center, Sacramento Lodi Train Station Elk Grove Blvd/Emerald Vista, Elk Grove Concilio, Isleton Post Office, Walnut Grove
Lodi – Lodi Transit	Lodi Station Wal-Mart and Target stores - off Hwy 12 at Lower Sacramento Road
Sacramento – Sacramento Regional Transit District	Arden Fair Mall Cosumnes River College Cal State University at Sacramento (CSUS) Florin Mall Sunrise Mall
Eastern Contra Costa County Transit District - Tri-Delta Transit	Los Medanos College Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Hillcrest Park & Ride Brentwood Park & Ride
San Joaquin County – SMART	Channel and Sutter – Downtown Transit Center (under construction) Claremont Mall Yokuts Mall

In addition to the fixed-route transit systems described above, Solano County also offers countywide paratransit service through Solano Paratransit (SP). SP serves residents throughout the county, except those living in Vallejo or Benicia. Service is only available to those residents who qualify for the

service under ADA, have completed Fairfield/Suisun Transit's ADA application form and been approved. SP operates Monday through Friday from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm and Saturday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. Passengers can purchase a multi-ride pass for \$15.00. SP's service area extends beyond the  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile buffer around the fixed-route network that is required by the ADA to provide a comprehensive service to its passengers.

Currently, very few Rio Vista residents use SP and have been using it less than in years past. For the first three quarters of FY 2004, an average of 2 passengers used the service each month. Ridership averaged 5 passengers a month in FY 2003 and 19 passengers a month in FY 2002. However, it is worth noting that this is not inconsistent with the overall trend experienced by SP. Ridership for the entire paratransit service dropped by 5% between FY 2002 and FY 2003, and it appears that FY 2004 will experience a 9% drop from FY 2003.

#### **6.2.2 Intercity Transportation**

Although Rio Vista Transit provides intercity transportation, there are limits to how far away service is provided. Rail service and private bus services provide additional mobility options for Rio Vista residents who need to travel outside the region.

##### **Rail**

Although Rio Vista does not have any direct intercity rail service, it is within 30 miles of the Suisun City Amtrak station and the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station. Suisun's Amtrak station is served by the Capitol Corridor, which stops at stations between Sacramento, Oakland and San Jose, with connecting bus service to San Francisco. The Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station provides direct service to downtown Oakland, downtown San Francisco, the San Francisco International Airport and many other parts of the Bay Area.

##### **Greyhound**

Rio Vista's nearest Greyhound station is also in Suisun City, roughly 22 miles away. The station offers fairly extensive operating hours - Monday through Friday, 5:45 AM to 6:00 PM, and Saturday 8:30 AM to 12:30 PM.

##### **Charter Buses**

Private bus service is also provided through charter services. Due to Rio Vista's proximity to Napa Valley and its famous wineries, many of the charter companies in the area cater to tourists and offer trips to the Napa Valley.

##### **Airporters**

Several airporter services will pick up and drop off in Rio Vista. These are privately operated, door-to-door services that operate seven days a week. This gives Rio Vista access to the three major airports in the area: Sacramento, Oakland, and San Francisco.

#### **6.2.3 Other**

While rail and bus services can meet regional travel needs, residents may have occasion to need door-to-door service outside of Rio Vista Transit's operating hours. For these trips, private transportation providers such as taxis and limousines are invaluable. Some of the companies that provide private transportation in and around Rio Vista are listed below.

**Rio Vista**

- Delta Cab Co.

**Fairfield**

- A Touch of Class Limousine
- Ambassador Limousine
- Bahia Limousine
- Checker Cab
- Commercial Taxi
- Fairfield Cab
- Greyline Cab
- KMA Corporate Sedan and Limousine Service
- Platinum Luxury Limousines
- Veteran's Cab
- Yellow Cab

**Antioch**

- Black Diamond Limousine Service
- Brentwood Cab
- D'Vince Limousine Service
- Yellow Cab Inc. Oakley
- Yellow Metro Cab

**6.3 Summary**

Due to Rio Vista's small size and relatively remote location, it has fewer transportation alternatives. In order to improve the mobility and accessibility of its residents, it is imperative that public officials from Rio Vista actively engage in the transportation planning process and advocate on behalf of its citizens for improved services. The Solano Transportation Authority can provide valuable technical support and advice to Rio Vista – but the people of Rio Vista must ultimately drive the request for support and interest in change.

## CHAPTER 7

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on information presented and analyzed in previous chapters, this chapter develops recommendations for Rio Vista Transit to implement. These recommendations address both the policy direction and operating characteristics of Rio Vista's transit service, with a focus on short-term improvements. Included with the discussion of each recommendation is a suggestion for who should take the lead on implementing the recommendation. Due to Rio Vista's limited range of experience operating transit service, additional collaboration with other transit agencies, the Solano Transportation Authority (STA), and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) will be critical to the future success of the service.

#### 7.1 Clarify Roles for Rio Vista Transit

Until recently, Rio Vista Transit has had a very basic organizational structure in which the transit driver works collaboratively with the mechanic and reports almost exclusively to the Finance Director. This arrangement was changed recently, such that the mechanic and driver both report to the Public Works Director and the Finance Director is solely responsible for the financial elements of the service. To ensure that there is an appropriate level of oversight of the transit service and that improvement is made in provision and tracking of the service, it is important to formalize the roles played by different parties, in the support and operation of Rio Vista Transit.

The Finance Director will continue to be responsible for filing TDA claim forms, but the responsibility to facilitate decision making on operating issues, and to collect and maintain data will fall to the Director of Public Works. The mechanic who services the transit vehicles and the drivers who operate them will be part of the Department of Public Works (DPW). Due to the inextricable link between funding and operations, it will be important for the two departments to communicate regularly about their respective needs. However, it is also worth noting that other city departments, particularly community development, should be included when making decisions about the future direction of transit within Rio Vista.

Rio Vista should also consider providing Rio Vista Transit with additional administrative support to assist with making and scheduling transit trips. This would permit the transit driver to spend all of their time making trips – instead of having to commit part of their day to returning phone calls and scheduling trips – resulting in a higher level of service for the community and better utilization of the transit vehicles. Depending of current staff commitments, an existing employee might be able to fill this role without the need to pay for additional help. It is expected that one person, working quarter time, would be sufficient to fulfill this role.

The following briefly describes the proposed role of each entity with regards to the transit system:

- **City Council** adopts policies directing how transit services should operate and makes decisions on the level of funding for the service.
- **City Manager** will serve as a liaison between city departments and the council and provide direction to city departments to ensure the implementation of coordinated and



effective transit service. In addition the City Manger will ensure that a city representative participates in regional transportation and planning studies that could impact Rio Vista.


- **Finance Director** provides financial oversight of the transit service.
- **Public Works Director** provides operational oversight of the transit service and supervises the mechanic and driver(s).
- **Transit Staff** responsible for trip planning, making trips, cleaning vehicle interiors, and collecting trip information.
- **Mechanic** maintains transit vehicle and tracks maintenance related data.

The recommended organizational chart for transit and a matrix of roles and responsibilities is presented in the next section to illustrate how city staff and outside agencies might work together to provide improved transit service. Adopting this structure as soon as possible will facilitate the successful implementation of the remaining recommendations.

## 7.2 Agency & Staff Responsibilities

As suggested at the beginning of this chapter, there are a number of areas in which Rio Vista would benefit from outside assistance and formally defined roles within the city. Figure 7-1, below, illustrates the proposed organizational structure for Rio Vista Transit and Table 7-1 identifies who should complete various tasks for the system. This includes recommendations for which tasks should fall within the purview of Rio Vista and which would be best addressed by another agency. This is a short-term recommendation that should be implemented as soon as possible.

**Figure 7-1 Proposed Organizational Structure**



**Table 7-1 Roles and Responsibilities**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Roles &amp; Responsibilities</b>
<b>Rio Vista</b>	
City Council	Provide policy direction Make funding decisions
City Manager	Serve as liaison between City Council and city departments Provide direction to ensure that the transit service is effectively implemented Participate in regional transit and transportation planning activities to ensure that the city's interests are being represented, or designate a representative to do such
Public Works	Supervise mechanic Provide regular oversight Formulate and update transit policies Conduct annual performance evaluations Update and distribute bus schedules Maintain and archive transit records and data
Finance	Prepare documents/reports as needed to receive TDA funding Explore opportunities for local funding Advise on funding availability
Transit Administration	Answer phone and/or respond to phone calls Schedule trips Maintain and submit log of scheduled trips and trip denials
Transit Driver(s)	Pick up and drop off passengers Maintain and submit log of completed trips Cycle wheelchair lift daily Clean vehicle interior
Mechanic	Clean exterior of transit vehicles Maintain vehicles Keep and submit maintenance log
<b>Solano Transportation Authority</b>	Finalize performance measurement system Help monitor transit demand Explore non-local funding opportunities
<b>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</b>	Update schedule and service information on 511 Provide guidance on financial reporting

### 7.3 Modify Service Schedule

According to trip data from the daily logs and discussions with the drivers and members of the public, it is evident that there is room to improve Rio Vista Transit's schedule. At a minimum, service to Fairfield should be rescheduled to a day other than Friday when some social service and government offices are closed. From the trip data, it is also evident that the supply of service to Antioch, Walnut Grove, and Isleton exceeds the demand. Table 7-2 presents an alternative service schedule that attempts to balance the supply of transit service with the demand for it.

This is a short-term recommendation that should be implemented as soon as possible.

**Table 7-2 Proposed Schedule**

Day	A.M.	P.M.
<b>Monday</b>	Fairfield	Rio Vista/Antioch
<b>Tuesday</b>	Lodi	Lodi/Walnut Grove/Isleton
<b>Wednesday</b>	Rio Vista	Rio Vista
<b>Thursday</b>	Fairfield	Fairfield/Vacaville
<b>Friday</b>	Lodi	Lodi

This schedule increases service to Fairfield from one to two days a week and eliminates service to Stockton. Monday trips to Fairfield must be relatively short in duration to allow time for the vehicle to return to Rio Vista by 12:30 PM. Monday afternoon trips will be made within Rio Vista and to Antioch. Those passengers who still need to travel to Stockton may transfer between Rio Vista Transit and transit service to Stockton at the Lodi Transportation Station. Lodi Transit has two routes (Routes 21 and 22) that serve Stockton and San Joaquin Regional Transit District's Routes 23 and 24 also serve Lodi. ADA-eligible passengers from Rio Vista should be certified for San Joaquin Regional Transit District's dial-a-ride service in order to use it to travel from Lodi to Stockton.

As mentioned above, as long as regional trips are prioritized on their scheduled day, accommodating local trips as time and space allow will improve the service's cost effectiveness and vehicle utilization.

The Public Works Department should review the proposed schedule, modify if necessary, and then present it for approval to the City Council. Upon adoption, the current and any new policies under the "Guidelines" section of the schedule should be updated. The revised schedule should be distributed to social service agencies, city departments, and municipal buildings for display and distribution, posted on the city's website, and provided to MTC to incorporate in the 511 information services.<sup>4</sup>

#### **7.4 Improve Data Collection**

In order to better understand the needs of its customers and to track its own performance, Rio Vista should improve its data collection. At a minimum, when scheduling trips, data should be collected on: scheduled pick-up time, pick-up location, destination (address/landmark/cross streets and city), if a trip is denied and if it is cancelled. For each completed trip the driver should collect information on: the actual pick-up time, trip destination, drop-off time, fare collected, trip purpose, if the wheelchair lift was deployed, and if the passenger did not show up. In addition, the mechanic should systematically track all road calls and preventable and non-preventable crashes. This is a short-term recommendation that should be implemented as soon as possible, as this data will be instrumental in gauging future transit needs.

<sup>4</sup> 511 is a toll-free and Web service ([www.511.org](http://www.511.org)) that provides consolidated information on transportation throughout the Bay Area. The service provides real-time information on traffic incidents, public transportation routes and fares, carpooling, vanpooling, and bicycling. Any changes in the transit service should be communicated to the Travel Information section of MTC. The current contact is Tom Spiekerman (510.817.3219).

The Public Works Department should refine the scheduling and trip sheets to include all of the desired information in a straightforward, easy to use format. Whoever schedules trips (whether it is the driver or an administrator) will be responsible for completing the scheduling forms and the driver will be responsible for the trip sheets. The completed forms should be submitted to the finance department monthly, at which time a spot check will reveal if the required information is being recorded. The mechanic should submit the log of road calls and crashes annually for review and storage with system files. All of these forms should be stored in organized files for future use. If possible, paper records should be converted to digital format prior to filing.

## **7.5 Improve Regulatory Compliance**

In addition to maintaining areas in which it is currently compliant, there are a few areas in which Rio Vista can improve its compliance with existing state and federal regulations. They are:

### **ADA**

- To facilitate the use of the transit system by persons with hearing impairments, Rio Vista Transit should have a telecommunication device or a toll-free service for deaf persons (TDD).
- To better plan for the needs of passengers with mobility devices, drivers should track each time the vehicle's wheelchair lift is used.
- To maintain the wheelchair lift and ensure that it is functioning, it should be cycled each day prior to starting the day's trips.
- Full-time *and* reserve drivers should all be given sensitivity training to better prepare them to courteously and competently meet the needs of persons with disabilities.

### **Other**

- Drivers and mechanics should all have a commercial driver's license and the drivers should also have the GPPV certificate and the passenger endorsement.
- Rio Vista should formally review all applicable OSHA rules and regulations to determine if it needs to develop a formal program to ensure continued compliance with regards to the transit service.
- New drivers need to be trained to understand the transit service as provided as well as to understand the system's policies and the various requirements they must fulfill in operation of the transit service.

This is a short-term recommendation that should be implemented as soon as possible.

## **7.6 Formalize Transit Policies**

Adopting a coherent set of policies to direct the operation of Rio Vista Transit will clarify expectations for both passengers and staff and inform future decisions about appropriate service levels. The following discussion presents a number of areas in which Rio Vista Transit should adopt policies and makes recommendations as to their content. This is a short-term recommendation that should be implemented within 6 months.

**Reservation Policy:** A two-day advance reservation is the maximum notice that Rio Vista Transit should require and it should continue accepting same-day reservations as the schedule permits. If and when additional administrative assistance becomes available, reservations should be required no more than 24 hours in advance. However, this policy would be very difficult to implement if the driver continues to schedule and drive all trips. To establish an appropriate and realistic reservation policy, Rio Vista's City Council must first decide if it is interested and willing to provide additional funding and or support to the transit program.

Rio Vista Transit should continue to prioritize trips being made to the scheduled destination, but if demand warrants the system should consider allowing trips to other destinations when possible. At a minimum, Rio Vista Transit should allow trips within Rio Vista whenever the schedule permits.

**On-Time Policy:** Passengers should be picked up within 15 minutes before or after their scheduled pick-up time. Having more confidence in their ability to use transit for a particular trip will encourage increased use by passengers.

**Cancellation Policy:** Due to the limitations caused by having the driver develop the service schedule, an appropriate cancellation policy is to require 12 hours advance notice of a cancellation. This policy allows the schedule for the next day to be adjusted in advance – which could improve the chances of using the available time slot. When passengers cancel a trip less than 12 hours before the scheduled trip time, the passenger should be sent a warning that details the cancellation policy and consequences. After a third late cancellation, the passenger should lose their transit privileges for a period of 6 months. If an administrator takes over the scheduling duties, the cancellation window can be reduced to 2 hours before the trip.

**No-Show Policy:** When passengers fail to cancel a trip and are not present at their designated pick-up time they are considered a “no-show” and Rio Vista should send the passenger a warning which details the cancellation policy and consequences. After a third no-show, the passenger should lose their transit privileges for a period of 6 months. When passengers miss their scheduled trips, they waste valuable resources that could have been used more productively on other riders. Therefore, it is important to enforce the no-show policy.

Once a decision has been made on providing administrative support to the transit drivers, the Director of Public Works should make recommendations to the City Manager and council on formal reservation, on time, cancellation, and no-show policies. If needed, additional information on these policies can be gathered from other Solano or San Joaquin County transit agencies.

## **7.7 Implement Performance Measurement System**

Rio Vista Transit should review the proposed (see Chapter 4) performance measures and standards, make any necessary modifications, and adopt a formal performance measurement system. The table (Table 7-3) below summarizes the proposed performance measures and their corresponding standards. For those measures without standards at this time, a notation of “monitor” signifies that Rio Vista should track data on the measure for six months and then use that information to establish an appropriate standard. This is also a short-term recommendation that should be implemented within 1 year.

Due to the more technical nature of this recommendation, STA should take the lead on finalizing the performance measurement system in consultation with Rio Vista. The resulting system should be presented for adoption to the City Council. Once the performance measurement system is established, the Department of Public Works should compile the relevant transit data and evaluate system performance, in advance of the annual budget process.

**Table 7-3 Performance Measures and Standards**

Performance Area	Performance Measure	FY 02/03 Performance	Proposed Standard
<b>Service Effectiveness</b>	Passenger trips per vehicle mile	0.08 pax/veh-mi	0.11 pax/veh-mi
	Passenger trips per vehicle hour	0.86 pax/veh-hr	1.1 pax/veh-hr
<b>Cost Efficient</b>	Operating cost per vehicle mile	\$4.23	\$3.60
	Operating cost per vehicle hour	\$45.02	\$36.70
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>	Operating cost per unlinked passenger trip	\$52.38	\$41.00
<b>Vehicle Utilization</b>	Passengers per vehicle	650 pax/veh	Monitor
	Miles per vehicle	7,927 mi/veh	Monitor
<b>Service Quality</b>			
- Accessibility	% of vehicles lift equipped	100%	100%
- Service Span	Hours of service	8:30 AM – 4:30 PM	8:30 AM – 4:30 PM
- Directness	Transit travel time/auto travel time	NA	≤ 2
- Comfort/Satisfaction	Number of passenger complaints	NA	Monitor
- Reliability	% of trips within 15 minutes of scheduled pick-up time	NA	95%
	Number of trip denials	NA	Monitor
- Safety	Vehicle miles between preventable accident	NA	80,000 miles

“NA” means that there is insufficient data to report on.

“Monitor” means that Rio Vista Transit should evaluate the system’s performance over a period of six months before establishing an appropriate standard.

## 7.8 Expand Funding Sources

Given Rio Vista Transit’s dependence on TDA funds and that the City has had to contribute more funding to the system, everyone would benefit from identifying additional funding sources. This would make Rio Vista less sensitive to fluctuations in TDA funding and put it in a better position to grow with increasing demand. This is a short-term recommendation that should be implemented within 1 to 2 years, if not sooner.

The most logical funding source would be FTA 5311 – Non-urbanized Area Formula Program for Public Transportation – operating funds. Rio Vista could also apply for State Transportation Assistance (STA) funds, but due to the small size of the city and its limited fare revenues, this source would not generate a significant amount of revenue.

Rio Vista may also wish to consider local funding sources such as transportation impact fees on development projects. This particular local funding strategy has considerable potential given the amount of development scheduled to occur in the near future and its likelihood of increasing demand for transit service. As suggested earlier, Rio Vista may also want to work directly with Trilogy to expand the level of transit service available to its residents. One possibility would be to negotiate an arrangement with Trilogy to finance a shopping shuttle once or twice a week using the second transit vehicle. Options include a cost-sharing agreement for dedicated service or a flash pass program. For the flash pass program, Trilogy could purchase passes in bulk at a discounted rate. Then all Trilogy residents would be issued a pass and would show the pass in lieu of paying a fare for each trip they make.

Due to the relatively high fares charged for trips outside of Rio Vista, raising regional fares should not be considered a viable short-term solution unless efforts will be implemented to subsidize fares for qualifying low-income residents. The fare for local, Rio Vista trips could be increased by \$0.25 without dramatically reducing existing ridership. However, it should be kept in mind that this would not generate much additional revenue without a significant increase in ridership. For example, in order for local fares to cover the difference between 10% of the operating expenses and collected fares in 2003, they would have to be over \$4.00 a trip. An increase of this magnitude would dramatically reduce the number of passengers willing to use the service.

STA is the most logical entity to evaluate the viability of non-local funding sources while the Finance Department should take the lead on expanding local funding sources. It is expected that a variety of approaches will need to be pursued to effectively meet the needs of the transit service.

## **7.9 Improve Vehicle Utilization**

In addition to the schedule changes suggested above, as the city grows Rio Vista Transit should consider making its second vehicle available on demand to improve its vehicle utilization. This change would double the system's capacity and provide more service to the community, as it is needed. Operating the second vehicle would, of course, require having a second driver on call. Possible uses for this second vehicle include: intra-Rio Vista trips on days when service is regularly scheduled for other cities, service to Trilogy, trips to social service agencies, or commute service to BART. This is a mid-term recommendation that Rio Vista should revisit in a couple of years once more complete data has been collected.

As the community and demand for transit grows, the system should accommodate any increase in demand through the utilization of both of its vehicles. Depending on what additional services are offered will suggest ways to fund the service. For example, if special transit service is provided to Trilogy residents, Rio Vista should work with Trilogy to establish a cost-sharing agreement or another approach to help offset the costs incurred to serve its community. When it is time to increase service, Rio Vista should consider exchanging its Ford van for an ADA-accessible vehicle to serve as a backup.

Although its utilization rate is low, Rio Vista does not appear to have sufficient demand for two vehicles in regular operation at this time. STA should work with Rio Vista staff to monitor ridership and trip denials to determine when an increase in service is appropriate. When demand warrants an increase in service the discussion will need to expand within the city to set appropriate funding levels.

## **7.10 Conclusion**

Rio Vista Transit is currently providing valuable transportation service to a group of dedicated passengers, but can improve its policies and practices. As the city grows and matures, its transit system will need to grow along with it. The recommendations presented here will help Rio Vista improve the quality of its service, better organize and coordinate its efforts, comply with all applicable state and federal laws, and enable it to expand when demand warrants.



---

# APPENDIX

## RIO VISTA TRANSIT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. **Do you ride the Rio Vista Transit system?**
  - ☐ **Yes, how often?**
    - ☐ Daily
    - ☐ Weekly
    - ☐ A few times a month
    - ☐ A few times a year
  - ☐ **No (Skip to Question 3)**
2. **Where do you ride Rio Vista Transit? (check all that apply)**
  - ☐ Antioch
  - ☐ Fairfield
  - ☐ Isleton
  - ☐ Lodi
  - ☐ Rio Vista
  - ☐ Stockton
  - ☐ Vacaville
  - ☐ Walnut Grove
  - ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
3. **What do you think about Rio Vista Transit? What, if anything, would you change?**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. **If you don't ride Rio Vista Transit, what would entice you to ride? (check all that apply)**
  - ☐ More frequent service
  - ☐ More information about the existing system
  - ☐ Improved regional connections
  - ☐ Nothing, I prefer to drive
  - ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
5. **Do you have any other comments or suggestions?** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME & COMMENTS!**

Engineers

Architects

Planners

## URBITRAN REPORT

### New York

71 West 23rd Street  
New York, NY 10010  
212.366.6200

12 West 27th Street, 12th Floor  
New York, NY 10001  
212.366.6200

6 Meadowlark Drive  
Cohoes, NY 12047  
P.O. Box 524  
518.235.8429

### New Jersey

2 Ethel Road - Suite 205B  
Edison, NJ 08817  
732.248.5422

150 River Road, Building E  
Menloville, NJ 07045  
973.299.2910

### Connecticut

50 Union Avenue  
Union Station, Third Floor East  
New Haven, CT 06519  
203.789.9977

### California

1440 Broadway, Suite 500  
Oakland, CA 94612  
510.839.0810

450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 600  
Glendale, CA 91203  
818.291.6381

### Massachusetts

275 Southampton Road  
Holyoke, MA 01040  
413.539.9005

### Pennsylvania

538 Spruce Street, Suite 612  
Scranton, PA 18503  
570.961.1413

[www.urbitran.com](http://www.urbitran.com)



DATE: January 14, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Elizabeth Richards, SSCI Program Director  
RE: SolanoLinks Transit Consortium Draft 2005 Work Plan

**Background:**

Each year, the Consortium reviews and updates its annual Work Plan. In 2005, there are a number of key local and regional transit planning activities and projects that the Consortium should be involved with. These range from service and funding to planning and marketing.

**Discussion:**

STA staff has prepared a draft SolanoLinks Transit Consortium Work Plan for the Consortium's review. Consortium members are encouraged to review the attached draft Work Plan and offer additions, deletions, and modifications.

The Consortium's 2004 Work Plan with a progress report is attached (Attachment B).

**Recommendation:**

Approve the SolanoLinks Transit Consortium Work Plan for 2005 as specified on Attachment A.

**Attachment:**

- A. 2005 SolanoLinks Transit Consortium Work Plan
- B. 2004 SolanoLinks Transit Consortium Work Plan Progress

**STA SolanoLinks Transit Consortium  
Draft 2005 Work Plan  
(January 2005)**

**Transit Service:**

- Implement RM 2 transit services.
- Monitor Rt. 30 and other Solano intercity transit services.
- Implement Dixon Community Based Transit Plan priorities.
- Implement TranStar countywide
- Implement Rio Vista Transit service changes

**Transit Planning and Consolidation**

- Initiate Transit Consolidation Study
- Input into SB916 Transit connectivity Study
- Complete Community Based Transportation Planning study in Cordelia.
- Complete Benicia, Fairfield, and Vallejo local transit studies
- Complete the Transit Element for the updated Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) including the Transit Element.
- Complete Highway 12 corridor transit study
- Monitor implementation of countywide Advance Vehicle Locator (AVL) system

**Funding**

- Monitor and provide input into legislation to ensure adequate levels of transit funding.
- Monitor and provide input into regional policy development to ensure adequate levels of transit funding.
- Update TDA matrix funding for Solano County
- Complete TDA Unmet Transit Needs process for FY 05/06.
- Prepare multi-year STAF funding plan
- Prepare multi-year funding plans for Intercity Transit Service, including Rt. 30 and Solano Paratransit.
- Develop funding partnerships for SolanoWORKS transportation study priorities.

**Marketing of Transit Services and Programs**

- Develop new SolanoLinks multi-year marketing plan and secure consultant support.
- Plan and implement marketing support for Rt. 30, new RM2 services, and Rio Vista Transit.
- Coordinate and participate in countywide and regional transit marketing activities.
- Distribute SolanoLinks brochure and wall maps.
- Develop public awareness and identity for Solano Paratransit.

## STA SolanoLinks Transit Consortium 2004 Work Plan Progress

### Transit Service:

- **Monitor and market Rt. 30 to achieve 20% farebox recovery rate:** Rt. 30 has been monitored throughout 2004. Using costs assumptions within the existing multi-year funding scenario and in the monthly reports, by Fall 2004 Rt. 30 had achieved a 20% farebox recovery rate.
- **Implement new transit service to Benicia Industrial Park from mid-Solano County:** Not implemented.
- **Monitor Solano Paratransit service.** Solano Paratransit has been monitored throughout 2004.
- **Implement SolanoWORKs Transit Study priorities:** The SolanoWORKs transportation advisory committee met several times in 2004. Three Low Income Flexible Transportation (LIFT) grant funding proposals were prepared and submitted to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). MTC did not select any of the projects for regional funding.
- **Implement TranStar countywide:** Vallejo and Benicia Transit are on-line. Fairfield-Suisun Transit is working with MTC to implement. Vacaville City Coach and MTC have come to an impasse on this project.

### Transit Planning and Consolidation

- **Complete countywide Senior and Disabled Transit Study:** Completed
- **Input into SB916 Transit Connectivity Study:** Actively participating and letter written from STA Board supporting the addition of Fairfield Transportation Center as a key regional hub.
- **Complete Community Based Transportation Planning studies in Dixon and Cordelia; initiate study in Vallejo:** Dixon study was completed. Two LIFT grant proposals were prepared and submitted to MTC. MTC selected one project for LIFT funding. Additional local funding is in the process of being secured to implement the other project in early 2005. Dixon community transportation stakeholders group established for long-term priority project implementation.
- **Complete Rio Vista, Fairfield, and Vallejo local transit studies:** Rio Vista Transit study completed and scheduled to Rio Vista City Council approval in January 2005.
- **Complete Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) follow up studies:** All studies completed except the Transit Consolidation Study which is scheduled for initiation in early 2005.
  - Transit Corridor Study follow-up
  - Oakland-Sacramento Commuter Rail Study, Phase II
  - Funding for Transit (Linked to sales tax)
  - Transit Consolidation Study
- **Complete Countywide Express Bus Service and Funding Plan (I-80/I-860/I-780 corridors):** Work begun, schedule for completion in early 2005.

- **Initiate Highway 12 Transit study:** Consultant selection completed and study to kick-off January 2005.
- **Monitor countywide Advance Vehicle Locator (AVL) system:** Status reports provided by lead agency, Fairfield-Suisun Transit

## **Funding**

- **Monitor and provide input into the RTP process to ensure adequate levels of transit funding:** The RTP was monitored and input was provided.
- **Monitor and provide input into legislation to ensure adequate levels of transit funding:** Legislation was monitored and input provided.
- **Update annual TDA matrix:** The TDA matrix
- **Prepare multi-year STAF funding plan:** Completed
- **Prepare multi-year funding scenarios.** Not completed. To be completed in early 2005

## **Marketing of Transit Services and Programs**

- **Update, reprint, distribute SolanoLinks Brochures.** Updated and 15,000 printed in early 2004; distributed 5900, 2000 in FY04/05.
- **Update, reprint, distribute SolanoLinks Wall Maps:** Updated and 200 printed in early 2004. 97 distributed to date.
- **Coordinate and participate in countywide and regional transit marketing activities.** Attended Bay Area Regional Transit Marketing Committee and Sacramento Transportation Demand Management Working Group. Promoted transit through countywide events, displays, and calls. Back-up Vallejo Baylink telephones and regularly supply Suisun City Amtrak station on Capitol Corridor's behalf.
- **Review SNCI transit marketing in communities:** Monthly SNCI status reports provided to Consortium



DATE: January 18, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Daryl K. Halls, Executive Director  
RE: Legislative Update – Jan 2005

**Background:**

Each year, STA staff monitors state and federal legislation that pertains directly to transportation and related issues. On January 12, 2005, the STA Board adopted its Legislative Priorities and Platform for 2005 to provide policy guidance on transportation legislation and the STA's legislative activities. The adopted version of the STA's Legislative Priorities and Platform for 2005 included several amendments requested by the Benicia City Council and subsequently amended into the Platform by the STA Board at the meeting. A copy of the adopted Priorities and Platform is attached

**Discussion:**

In December 2004, the State Legislature introduced two Assembly Constitutional Amendments consistent with adopted legislative priorities of the STA. These two bills have been added to the Legislative matrix for consideration by the STA Board.

**ACA 4 (Plescia and Harman) – Support**

This bill would eliminate the provision authorizing the State Legislature and the Governor to suspend the transfer of sales taxes on motor vehicle fuel revenues from the State General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund for a fiscal year due to a fiscal emergency. This transfer of revenues to transportation was approved by California's voters with the passage of Proposition 42. This legislation is consistent with the STA's Legislative Priority # 7 – "Support efforts to prevent the future suspension of Proposition 42, diverting voter approved funds dedicated for transportation to the state general fund."

**ACA 7 (Nation) - Support**

This bill would lower the voting threshold for passing local option sales taxes from the current 2/3 voter requirement to 55 percent. This legislation is consistent with the STA's Legislative Priority #4 – "Support initiatives to pursue the 55% voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures."

**Recommendation:**

Forward the following recommendations to the STA Board:

1. Support for ACA 4.
2. Support for ACA 7.



**Attachments:**

- A. STA's Legislative Priorities and Platform for 2005
- B. Letter from Benicia City Council dated 1/5/05
- C. Memo Summarizing STA Staff Analysis dated 1/12/05
- D. Legislative Matrix – January 2005 (to be provided under separate cover)
- E. ACA 4 (Plescia and Harman)
- F. ACA 7 (Nation)

## 2005 STA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM

### Solano Transportation Authority 2005 Legislative Priorities and Platform (adopted by STA Board 1/12/05)

#### LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

1. Monitor and support, as appropriate, legislative proposals to increase funding for transportation infrastructure.
2. Oppose efforts to reduce or divert funding from transportation projects.
3. Pursue federal and state funding for the following priority projects and transit services:
  - a. I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange \*
  - b. Jepson Parkway Project\*
  - c. Vallejo Intermodal Station\*
  - d. Vallejo Baylink Ferry Service
  - e. Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Station\*
  - f. Capitol Corridor Rail Service and track improvements throughout Solano County
  - g. Inter-city transit
4. Support initiatives to pursue the 55% voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures.
5. Monitor legislative efforts to merge MTC and ABAG governing boards and their respective responsibilities.
6. Monitor the progress of the \$3 bridge toll, support the implementation of Regional Measure 2 funded projects, and oppose efforts to divert RM 2 funds from the RM 2 expenditure plan to cover cost increases on the Bay Bridge.
7. Support efforts to prevent the future suspension of Proposition 42, diverting voter approved funds dedicated for transportation to the state general fund.

*\* Federal Priority Projects*

## 2005 STA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM

### *I. Air Quality*

1. Support use of Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA) funds for clean fuel projects.
2. Monitor and review approval of the 2004 Ozone Attainment Plan by EPA.
3. Support legislation, which ensures that any fees imposed to reduce vehicle miles traveled, or to control mobile source emissions, are used to support transportation programs that provide congestion relief or benefit air quality.
4. Monitor legislation providing infrastructure for low, ultra-low and zero emission vehicles.
5. Monitor and comment on regulations regarding diesel fuel exhaust particulates and alternative fuels.
6. Support policies that improve the environmental review process to minimize conflicts between transportation and air quality requirements.
7. Monitor energy policies and alternative fuel legislation or regulation that may affect fleet vehicle requirements for mandated use of alternative fuels.
8. Support legislation to provide funding for innovative, intelligent/advanced transportation and air quality programs, which relieve congestion, improve air quality and enhance economic development.
9. Support legislation to finance cost effective conversion of public transit fleets to alternative fuels.
10. Support income tax benefits or incentives that encourage use of alternative fuel vehicles, van pools and public transit without reducing existing transportation or air quality funding levels.

## **2005 STA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM**

### ***II. Alternative Modes (Bicycles, HOV, Livable Communities, Ridesharing)***

1. Support legislation promoting bicycling and bicycle facilities as a commute option.
2. Oppose expanded use of HOV lanes for purposes not related to congestion relief and air quality improvement.
3. Support legislation providing land use incentives in connection with rail and multimodal transit stations – transit oriented development.

### ***III. Congestion Management***

1. Support administrative or legislative action to ensure consistency among the Federal congestion management and the State's Congestion Management Program requirements.

### ***IV. Employee Relations***

1. Monitor legislation and regulations affecting labor relations, employee rights, benefits, and working conditions. Preserve a balance between the needs of the employees and the resources of public employers that have a legal fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers.
2. Monitor any legislation affecting workers compensation that impacts employee benefits, control of costs, and, in particular, changes that affect self-insured employers.

### ***V. Funding***

1. Protect Solano County's statutory portions of the state highway and transit funding programs.
2. Seek a fair share for Solano County of any state discretionary funding made available for transportation grants or programs.

## **2005 STA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM**

3. Protect State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) from use for purposes other than those covered in SB 140 of 1997 reforming transportation planning and programming.
4. Support state budget and California Transportation Commission allocation to fully fund projects for Solano County included in the State Transportation Improvement Program and the Comprehensive Transportation Plans of the county.
5. Support transportation initiatives that increase the overall funding levels for transportation priorities in Solano County.
6. Advocate for primacy of general transportation infrastructure funding over high-speed rail project and Bay Area Ferry Authority.
7. Support measures to restore local government's property tax revenues used for general fund purposes, including road rehabilitation and maintenance.
8. Seek a fair share for Solano County of any federal funding made available for transportation programs and projects.
9. Support legislation to secure adequate budget appropriations for highway, bus, rail, air quality and mobility programs in Solano County.
10. Support efforts to pass a new federal transportation reauthorization bill that maintains the funding categories and flexibility of TEA 21, provides a higher level of overall transportation funding, and provides a fair share return of funding for California.
11. Support state policies that assure timely allocation of transportation revenue, including allocations of new funds available to the STIP process as soon as they are available.
12. Support legislation or the development of administrative policies to allow a program credit for local funds spent on accelerating STIP projects through right-of-way purchases, or environmental and engineering consultant efforts

## **2005 STA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM**

13. Support or seek legislation to assure a dedicated source of funding, other than the State Highway Account for local streets and roads maintenance and repairs.
14. Monitor the distribution of state transportation demand management funding.
15. Oppose any proposal that could reduce Solano County's opportunity to receive transportation funds, including diversion of state transportation revenues for other purposes. Fund sources include, but are not limited to, the Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA), State Highway Account (SHA), Public Transit Account (PTA), and Transportation Development Act (TDA) and any ballot initiative.

### ***VI. Liability***

1. Monitor legislation affecting the liability of public entities, particularly in personal injury or other civil wrong legal actions.

### ***VII. Paratransit***

1. In partnership with other affected agencies and local governments seek additional funding for paratransit operations, including service for persons with disabilities and senior citizens.

### ***VIII. Project Delivery***

1. Support legislation to encourage the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency to reform administrative procedures to expedite federal review and reduce delays in payments to local agencies and their contractors for transportation project development, right-of-way and construction activities.
2. Support legislation and/or administrative reforms to enhance Caltrans project delivery, such as simultaneous Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and engineering studies, and a reasonable level of contracting out of appropriate activities to the private sector.

## **2005 STA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM**

3. Support legislation and/or administrative reforms that result in cost and/or timesavings to environmental clearance processes for transportation construction projects.
4. Continue to streamline federal application/reporting/monitoring requirements to ensure efficiency and usefulness of data collected and eliminate unnecessary and/or duplicative requirements.

### ***IX Rail***

1. In partnership with other affected agencies, sponsor making Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority an eligible operator for state transit assistance with funds to be apportioned to member agencies.
2. In partnership with other counties located along Capitol Corridor, seek expanded state commitment for funding passenger rail service, whether state or locally administered.
3. Support legislation and/or budgetary actions to assure a fair share of State revenues of intercity rail (provided by Capitol Corridor) funding for Northern California and Solano County.
4. Seek legislation to assure that dedicated state intercity rail funding is allocated to the regions administering each portion of the system and assure that funding is distributed on an equitable basis.
5. Seek funds for the development of intercity, regional and commuter rail service connecting Solano County to the Bay Area and Sacramento regions.
6. Continue to monitor and evaluate the proposed \$10 billion High Speed Rail Bond scheduled for the November 2004 ballot.

### ***X. Ferry***

1. Protect the existing source of operating support for Vallejo Baylink ferry service, most specifically the Bridge Tolls–Northern Bridge

## **2005 STA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM**

Group “1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Dollar” revenues which provide a 5 percent and 2 percent set aside for transit operations and ferry capital, respectively.

2. Support the implementation of expanded Vallejo Baylink ferry and countywide express bus service funded from the “3<sup>rd</sup> Dollar” Bridge Toll (Measure 2) program and oppose proposals to divert these funds to other purposes than those stipulated in the expenditure plan for RM 2.
3. Work with MTC to obtain an increase to the federal Ferryboat Discretionary (FBD) Funds to provide an annual earmark for the Bay Area, similar to Washington State and Alaska, with priority given to existing ferry capital projects.

### ***XI. Safety***

1. Support legislation or administrative procedures to streamline the process for local agencies to receive funds for road repair from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

### ***XII. Transit***

1. Protect funding levels for transit by opposing state funding source reduction without substitution of comparable revenue.
2. Support an income tax credit to employers for subsidizing employee transit passes.
3. Support tax benefits and/or incentives for transportation demand management programs and alternative fuel programs to promote the use of public transit.
4. In partnership with other transit agencies, seek strategies to assure public transit receives a fair share of funding for welfare-to-work social services care, and other community-based programs.



## **2005 STA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM**

5. Support efforts to eliminate or ease Federal requirements and regulations regarding the use of federal transit funds for transit operations in large UZAs.
6. Support efforts to change Title 23 restrictions pertaining to use of bridge toll revenues for federalized bridges for transit operations.
7. In addition to new bridge tolls, work with MTC to generate new regional transit revenues to support the ongoing operating and capital needs of transit services, including bus and ferry and rail.

Public Works Department  
Engineering Division  
*www.ci.benicia.ca.us*

**by Fax and Regular Mail**

January 5, 2005

Mr. Daryl Halls, Executive Director  
Solano Transportation Authority  
One Harbor Center, Suite 130  
Suisun City, California 94585

**SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED 2005 STA LEGISLATIVE  
PRIORITIES AND PLATFORM**

Dear Mr. Halls:

On behalf of the City Council of the City of Benicia, enclosed are comments and revisions recommended by the Council at their January 4, 2005 meeting on the proposed 2005 STA Legislative Priorities and Platform.

The Council provided the following revisions, shown in underline/~~strikeout~~ format:

1. The Council suggests that the term “federal priority projects” listed in Legislative Priority No. 3 be defined to note that it includes transit projects.
2. **Legislative Priority.** Revise No. 4 to read, “Support initiatives to pursue the 55% voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures that are linked to land use.”
3. **Section III - Alternative Modes.** Revise No. 3 to read, “Support ~~Monitor~~ legislation providing land use incentives in connection rail and multimodal transit stations – transit oriented development.”
4. **Section VI - Funding.** Revise No. 6 to read, “Recognize that there must be a balance between ~~Advocate for primacy of~~ general transportation infrastructure funding, ~~over~~ high-speed rail project and Bay Area Ferry Authority.”
5. **Section VI - Funding.** Revise No. 10 to read, “Support efforts to pass a new federal transportation reauthorization bill linked to land use that maintains the funding categories and flexibility of TEA 21, provides a higher level of overall transportation funding, and provides a fair share return of funding for California.”
6. **Section VIII - Project Delivery.** Revise No. 1 to read, “Support legislation

**Mr. Daryl Halls**

January 5, 2005

Page 2

that acknowledges the smart growth policies of the MTC and ABAG to the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration...

7. **Section IX - Rail.** Revise No. 6 to read, "Consider supporting ~~Continue to monitor and evaluate~~ the proposed \$10 billion High Speed Rail Bond scheduled for the November 2006 ~~2004~~ ballot."
8. **Section X – Ferry.** Add No. 4, "Support the expansion to Benicia of the Vallejo Baylink Ferry service."

The Council also requested the December 9, 2004 Benicia Needs Assessment for the Comprehensive Transportation Plan submitted by our Director of Public Works be modified to indicate that "Widening of the State Park Road Overcrossing at I-780" be listed as a Route of Regional Significance, and that under Benicia's Local Needs that "Citywide Traffic Calming" be included in the listing.

Please feel free to contact me at (707) 746-4240 should you have any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Throne, PE  
City Engineer

MT:kt  
DOCUMENT2

cc: James Erickson, City Manager  
Daniel Schiada, Director of Public Works

To: STA Board  
 From: Daryl K. Halls, Executive Director  
 Subject: STA Staff Analysis of the revisions to the 2005 STA Legislative Priorities and Platform requested by the City of Benicia  
 Date: January 12, 2005

**Background/Discussion:**

On January 7, 2005, the STA received a letter from the City of Benicia, on behalf of their City Council, containing a list of eight comments and requested revisions to the proposed 2005 STA Legislative Priorities and Platform. List below is a brief analysis by staff of these eight requested comments/revisions.

The Benicia City Council provided the following revisions, shown in underline/~~strikeout~~ format:

1. The Council suggests that the term “federal priority projects” listed in Legislative Priority No. 3 be defined to note that it includes transit projects.

*Staff Analysis: Staff recommends modifying Legislative Priority #3 from “Pursue project funding for:” to “Pursue federal and state funding for the following priority projects and transit services:”*

2. **Legislative Priority.** Revise No. 4 to read, “Support initiatives to pursue the 55% voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures that are linked to land use.”

*Staff Analysis: Legislative efforts to change the voter threshold from the current 66.7% to 55% for county transportation measures are being undertaken as a part of a statewide coalition. The STA Board has recently approved the Countywide Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) plan for Solano County that provides the goals, projects and funding to plan for and implement transportation projects that better link transportation and land use. Consistent with other policies contained in the proposed platform, it is proposed that the linkages between transportation and land use be considered and implemented at the local and county level and encouraged by fiscal incentives, and not imposed by the state or through state mandates.*

3. **Section III – Alternative Modes.** Revise No. 3 to read, “Support Monitor legislation providing land use incentives in connection rail and multimodal transit stations – transit oriented development.”

*Staff Analysis: Staff recommends making this revision as proposed.*

4. **Section VI – Funding.** Revise No. 6 to read, “Recognize that there must be a balance between Advocate for primacy of general transportation infrastructure funding, over high-speed rail project and Bay Area Ferry Authority.”

*Staff Analysis:* Staff recommends not modifying this policy as proposed. Four of the STA's priorities for federal earmarks and state funding has been the Vallejo Baylink Ferry Service, the Vallejo Station, the Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Station, and Capitol Corridor Rail Service and track improvements throughout Solano County, and which directly benefits Solano County commuters and users of transit. Support for a balance of funding from general transportation infrastructure funding (such as STIP and federal earmarks) for the high speed rail project and the Bay Area Ferry Authority would jeopardize or dilute the STA's efforts to obtain funding for the four priority projects and transit services previously mentioned.

5. **Section VI – Funding.** Revise No. 10 to read, “Support efforts to pass a new federal transportation reauthorization bill linked to land use that maintains the funding categories and flexibility of TEA 21, provides a higher level of overall transportation funding, and provides a fair share return of funding for California.”

*Staff Analysis:* This proposed language maybe somewhat unnecessary and redundant. The current federal transportation reauthorization bill (TEA 21) and the proposed new reauthorization bill already provide the funding categories and flexibility that have resulted in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), Housing Incentives Program (HIP) and Transportation and Planning Land Use Solution (T-Plus) programs. The STA has taken advantage of these federally funded regional transportation programs and is the first Bay Area County to develop both a Countywide TLC and Pedestrian Plan.

6. **Section VIII – Project Delivery.** Revise No. 1 to read, “Support legislation that acknowledges the smart growth policies of the MTC and ABAG to the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration. . .”

*Staff Analysis:* The policy as written pertains to expediting review and reduce delays caused by federal agencies pertaining to the timely implementation of various federally funded transportation projects. Staff recommends that the proposed revision, if acceptable to the STA Board, would be better reflected in a separate policy statement.

7. **Section IX – Rail.** Revise No. 6 to read, “Consider supporting ~~Continue to monitor and evaluate~~ the proposed \$10 billion High Speed Rail Bond scheduled for the November 2006 ~~2004~~ ballot.”

*Staff Analysis:* If the Board is interested in considering this proposal, staff recommends this item be agendized as a separate item at a future Board meeting.

8. **Section X – Ferry.** Add No. 4, “Support the expansion to Benicia of the Vallejo Baylink Ferry service.”

*Staff Analysis: Support for expansion to Benicia of the Vallejo Baylink Ferry Service is not currently identified in the STA’s Comprehensive Transportation Plan, MTC’s T-2030 Plan or Vallejo Transit’s Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) for expanded Baylink Ferry Service. If the Board is interested in considering this proposal, staff recommends this item be agendized as a separate item at a future Board meeting.*

Attachment: “Comments on the Proposed 2005 STA Legislation Priorities and Platform,” City of Benicia, January 5, 2005

## CURRENT BILL STATUS

MEASURE : A.C.A. No. 4  
AUTHOR(S) : Plescia and Harman (Coauthor: Bogh).  
TOPIC : Transportation Investment Fund  
HOUSE LOCATION : ASM

## TYPE OF BILL :

Active  
Non-Urgency  
Non-Appropriations  
2/3 Vote Required  
Non-State-Mandated Local Program  
Non-Fiscal  
Non-Tax Levy

LAST HIST. ACT. DATE: 12/07/2004

LAST HIST. ACTION : From printer. May be heard in committee January 6.

TITLE : A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 1 of Article XIX B thereof, relating to transportation.

BILL NUMBER: ACA 4            INTRODUCED  
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY    Assembly Members Plescia and Harman  
(Coauthor: Assembly Member Bogh)

DECEMBER 6, 2004

A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 1 of Article XIX B thereof, relating to transportation.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACA 4, as introduced, Plescia.    Transportation Investment Fund  
Article XIX B of the California Constitution requires, commencing with the 2003-04 fiscal year, that sales taxes on motor vehicle fuel that are deposited into the General Fund be transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund for allocation to various transportation purposes. Article XIX B authorizes this transfer to the Transportation Investment Fund to be suspended in whole or in part for a fiscal year during a fiscal emergency pursuant to a proclamation by the Governor and the enactment of a statute by a 2/3 vote in each house of the Legislature if the statute does not contain any unrelated provision.

This measure would delete the provision authorizing the Governor and the Legislature to suspend the transfer of revenues from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund for a fiscal year during a fiscal emergency.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no. State-mandated local program: no.

Resolved by the Assembly, the Senate concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California at its 2005-06 Regular Session commencing on the sixth day of December 2004, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California, that the Constitution of the State be amended as follows:

That Section 1 of Article XIX B thereof is amended to read:

SECTION 1. (a) For the 2003-04 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, all moneys that are collected during the fiscal year from taxes under the Sales and Use Tax Law (Part 1 (commencing with Section 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code), or any successor to that law, upon the sale, storage, use, or other consumption in this State of motor vehicle fuel, and that are deposited in the General Fund of the State pursuant to that law, shall be transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund, which is hereby created in the State Treasury. (b) (1) For the 2003-04 to 2007-08 fiscal years, inclusive, moneys in the Transportation Investment Fund shall be allocated, upon appropriation by the Legislature, in accordance with Section 7104 of the Revenue and Taxation Code as that section read on ~~the operative date of this article~~ March 6, 2002 .

(2) For the 2008-09 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter,



moneys in the Transportation Investment Fund shall be allocated solely for the following purposes:

(A) Public transit and mass transportation.

(B) Transportation capital improvement projects, subject to the laws governing the State Transportation Improvement Program, or any successor to that program.

(C) Street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or storm damage repair conducted by cities, including a city and county.

(D) Street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or storm damage repair conducted by counties, including a city and county.

(c) For the 2008-09 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, moneys in the Transportation Investment Fund shall be allocated, upon appropriation by the Legislature, as follows:

(A) Twenty percent of the moneys for the purposes set forth in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

(B) Forty percent of the moneys for the purposes set forth in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

(C) Twenty percent of the moneys for the purposes set forth in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

(D) Twenty percent of the moneys for the purpose set forth in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

~~(d) The transfer of revenues from the General Fund of the State to the Transportation Investment Fund pursuant to subdivision (a) may be suspended, in whole or in part, for a fiscal year if both of the following conditions are met:~~

~~(1) The Governor has issued a proclamation that declares that the transfer of revenues pursuant to subdivision (a) will result in a significant negative fiscal impact on the range of functions of government funded by the General Fund of the State.~~

~~(2) The Legislature enacts by statute, pursuant to a bill passed in each house of the Legislature by rollcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership concurring, a suspension for that fiscal year of the transfer of revenues pursuant to subdivision (a), provided that the bill does not contain any other unrelated provision.~~

~~(e)~~

(d) The Legislature may enact a statute that modifies the percentage shares set forth in subdivision (c) by a bill passed in each house of the Legislature by rollcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership concurring, provided that the bill does not contain any other unrelated provision and that the moneys described in subdivision (a) are expended solely for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

## CURRENT BILL STATUS

MEASURE : A.C.A. No. 7  
AUTHOR(S) : Nation.  
TOPIC : Local governmental taxation: special taxes: voter  
approval.  
HOUSE LOCATION : ASM

TYPE OF BILL :  
Active  
Non-Urgency  
Non-Appropriations  
2/3 Vote Required  
Non-State-Mandated Local Program  
Non-Fiscal  
Non-Tax Levy

LAST HIST. ACT. DATE: 12/07/2004

LAST HIST. ACTION : From printer. May be heard in committee January 6.

TITLE : A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 4 of Article XIII A thereof, by amending Section 2 of Article XIII C thereof, and by amending Section 3 of Article XIII D thereof, relating to taxation.

BILL NUMBER: ACA 7            INTRODUCED  
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY    Assembly Member Nation

DECEMBER 6, 2004

A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 4 of Article XIII A thereof, by amending Section 2 of Article XIII C thereof, and by amending Section 3 of Article XIII D thereof, relating to taxation.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACA 7, as introduced, Nation.    Local governmental taxation: special taxes: voter approval.

The California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of 2/3 of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax, except that certain school entities may levy an ad valorem property tax for specified purposes with the approval of 55% of the voters within the jurisdiction of these entities.

This measure would change the 2/3 voter-approval requirement for special taxes to instead authorize a city, county, or special district to impose a special tax with the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the tax. This measure would also make technical, nonsubstantive changes to these provisions.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no. State-mandated local program: no.

Resolved by the Assembly, the Senate concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California at its 2005-06 Regular Session commencing on the sixth day of December 2004, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California, that the Constitution of the State be amended as follows:

First--That Section 4 of Article XIII A thereof is amended to read:

Section 4. ~~Cities, Counties and special districts,~~  
A city, county, or special district, by a  
~~two-thirds~~ 55 percent vote of  
~~the qualified electors of such district~~ its  
voters voting on the proposition, may impose ~~special~~  
~~taxes on such district~~ a special tax within that  
city, county, or special district, except an ad  
valorem ~~taxes~~ tax on real property or  
a ~~transaction~~ transactions tax or  
sales tax on the sale of real property within ~~such City,~~  
~~County~~ that city, county, or special district.

Second--That Section 2 of Article XIII C thereof is amended to read:

SEC. 2. ~~Local Government Tax Limitation.~~

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution: (a)

~~All taxes.~~ A tax imposed by any local government ~~shall be deemed to be~~ is either a general ~~taxes~~ tax or a special ~~taxes~~ tax.

~~Special.~~ A special purpose ~~districts~~ district or ~~agencies~~ agency, including a school ~~districts,~~ ~~shall~~ ~~have~~ district, has no ~~power~~ authority to levy a general ~~taxes~~ tax.

(b) ~~No.~~ A local government ~~may~~ shall not impose, extend, or increase any general tax unless and until that tax is submitted to the electorate and approved by a majority vote of its voters voting on the proposition. A general tax ~~shall~~ is not ~~be~~ deemed to have been increased if it is imposed at a rate not higher than the maximum rate so approved. The election required by this subdivision shall be consolidated with a regularly scheduled general election for members of the governing body of the local government, except in cases of emergency declared by a unanimous vote of the governing body.

(c) Any general tax imposed, extended, or increased, without voter approval, by any local government on or after January 1, 1995, and prior to the effective date of this article, ~~shall~~

may continue to be imposed only if that general tax is approved by a majority vote of the voters voting in an election on the issue of the imposition, which election ~~shall be~~ is held ~~within two years of the effective date of this article~~ no later than November 6, 1998, and in compliance with subdivision (b).

(d) ~~No.~~ A local government ~~may~~ shall not impose, extend, or increase any special tax unless and until that tax is submitted to the electorate and approved by a ~~two-thirds~~ 55 percent vote of its voters voting on the proposition. A special tax ~~shall~~ is not ~~be~~ deemed to have been increased if it is imposed at a rate not higher than the maximum rate so approved.

Third--That Section 3 of Article XIII D thereof is amended to read:

SEC. 3. ~~Property Taxes, Assessments, Fees and Charges~~

~~Limited.~~ (a) ~~No.~~ An agency shall not assess a tax, assessment, fee, or charge ~~shall be assessed by any agency~~ upon any parcel of property or upon any person as an incident of property ownership except: (1) The ad valorem property tax imposed pursuant to Article XIII and Article XIII A.

(2) Any special tax receiving a two-thirds or 55 percent vote, as applicable, pursuant to Section 1 or 4 of Article XIII A or subdivision (d) of Section 2 of Article XIII C.

(3) Assessments as provided by this article.

(4) Fees or charges for ~~property related~~ property-related services as provided by this article.

(b) For purposes of this article, fees for the provision of electrical or gas service ~~shall~~ are not ~~be~~ deemed charges or fees imposed as an

incident of property ownership.



DATE: January 18, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Daryl K. Halls, Executive Director  
RE: State Budget Update – January 2005

**Background/Discussion:**

The State of California has faced significant budget challenges since FY 2001-02, although the full magnitude of the problems did not surface until late 2002. On January 10, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger released his proposed 2005-06 State Budget. His proposed budget strives to eliminate an estimated \$8.1 billion state budget deficit through a combination of suspension of fund transfers from the State General Fund to schools (Proposition 98) and transportation (Proposition 42), cuts to various state funded programs such as Health and Social Services, borrowing, and some modest revenue augmentations. This proposed budget is projected by the Administration to offset the state budget deficit and result in a \$500 million budget reserve.

Under this proposal, Proposition 42 would be suspended for the third year in a row. The Governor's proposal to suspend all of Proposition 42 in FY 2005/06 would restore an estimated \$1.31 billion to the State General Fund. This suspension would leave no funds for the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), local streets and roads, or public transportation. If enacted by the State Legislature, this would result in an estimated loss of \$5 to \$6 million in STIP and local streets and roads funds from Solano County. The loss of TCRP funds could result in delays to the project development activities for the I-80/I-680/SR Interchange and SR 12 Jameson Canyon projects.


Attached is a copy of the excerpts from the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) 2004 Annual Report to the State Legislature that was released in December of 2004. This report documents and highlights the continuing fiscal crisis facing California's transportation infrastructure.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

**Attachments:**

- A. Shaw/Yoder Report on the Governor's Proposed 2005-06 State Budget
- B. Excerpts from the CTC's 2004 Annual Report to the State Legislature



January 10, 2005

To: Board Members, Solano Transportation Authority

Fm: Shaw / Yoder, Inc.

**RE: GOVERNOR'S PROPOSED 2005-06 BUDGET**

The Governor has now released his Proposed 2005-06 State Budget. In it, the Governor summarizes that California's economy continues to grow and expand, but is still not yet capable of sustaining program expenditures to which the state has already committed. As a result, the Governor estimates that "left unchecked, expenditures would exceed available revenues by \$9.3 billion in 2005-06." However, the "real" shortfall that the Governor is attempting to tackle is closer to \$8.1 billion. The difference can be attributed to what otherwise would have occurred versus planned current year and budget year suggestions. He proposes the following mechanisms to bring the state's budget in balance, without raising taxes:

Suspend Proposition 98 (schools)	\$2.284 billion
Suspend Proposition 42 (transportation)	\$1.311 billion
Cuts to Health and Human Services	\$1.167 billion
Cuts to General Government	\$928 million
Cuts to Other Programs	\$1.310 billion
Borrowing	\$1.683 billion
Revenue Issues	\$409 million
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9.092 billion</b>

According to the budget, these actions will balance the state's budget, and allow for a \$500 million budget reserve.

### *Transportation*

Specifically to transportation, the Governor proposes the following adjustments and initiatives:

- **Suspend Proposition 42** - The Governor proposes suspending all of Proposition 42, estimated to be \$1.31 billion, leaving nothing for Traffic Congestion Relief Program projects, the State Transportation Improvement Program, local streets and roads or public transportation. He does offer to designate this suspension yet another loan from transportation funds, as opposed to a straight grab. It should be noted that this revenue would be in addition to other outstanding loans the state has taken the last several years, raising the overall total to more than \$3.4 billion.

Tel: 916.446.4656  
 Fax: 916.446.4318  
 1414 K Street, Suite 320  
 Sacramento, CA 95814  
 123

The Governor will introduce a repayment program and schedule (estimated to be over 15 years beginning in 2006-07), but is not specific on where those repayment funds would come from.

In addition to the repayment offering, the Governor will propose a Constitutional Amendment to prevent further taking of Proposition 42 funds out of transportation effective starting in 2007-08. Language of that initiative is not revealed in the budget document, but it is good news that the Governor is publicly supporting the constitutional preservation of transportation funds beyond the budget year.

- **Tribal Gaming Revenue** – As part of last year's budget package, the Legislature agreed to send revenue available through tribal gaming compacts (about \$1.4 billion) to transportation as a way to backfill the revenue loss associated with the suspension of Proposition 42 in the current budget year. The Governor's budget notes that money has not yet been received due to litigation over the issuance of the bonds. The Governor will propose budget trailer bill language to direct those funds to transportation when the sale of the bonds are final. This will prevent other entities from seeking these funds for non-transportation purposes.
- **Spillover Funds** – The Governor estimates that the Public Transportation Account is supposed to receive a bump of \$216 million in spillover funds in the budget year as a result of certain economic conditions in California. However, instead of allowing that revenue to flow to public transportation, he proposes to suspend that transfer and leave it in the General Fund.
- **High-Speed Rail Authority** – The Governor intends to increase the funding for the High Speed Rail Authority from the current \$1.8 million budget to \$3.9 million.

To highlight the Governor's long-term support for transportation, he has called upon the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, and specifically the Department of Transportation to implement a concept and program called **GoCalifornia**. In his budget, the Governor summarizes this concept in the following ways:


"The continuing budget crisis forces fiscal actions in the short term that limit the availability of traditional transportation resources. However, the Administration proposes a comprehensive initiative, 'GoCalifornia,' to enhance the impact of transportation investments now and in the future. As part of this effort, new performance measures for both the transportation system and State management have been developed in partnership with statewide transportation stakeholders and are being implemented. Faster completion of transportation projects will save money and public-private partnerships will attract new money to improve mobility. In addition, the Administration will focus on improving and facilitating the movement of goods into ports and across the state, both to support growing industries, as well as to relieve congestion on freeways. Professional management, close collaboration with transportation partners, and responsible land use planning are important first steps in ensuring that transportation dollars are used most efficiently. However, the best use of transportation resources demands that the full range of delivery tools including design-build contracting, public-private partnerships, and other innovative methods be fully explored. The Administration will propose a comprehensive package of management and project delivery proposals for the 2005-06 legislative session."

These are the major issues raised by the Governor's Proposed 2005-06 State Budget. We will continue to analyze his documents and statements and continue to apprise you of relevant budget-related information.

Tel: 916.446.4656  
Fax: 916.446.4318  
1414 K Street, Suite 320  
Sacramento, CA 95814



# **CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**



## **2004 ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE**

**Adopted**

**December 9, 2004**



## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
A Message from the Chair .....	ii
The Commission in Brief.....	iii
The Commissioners .....	iv
<b>Issues 2005 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Trends and Outlook for State Transportation Financing .....	3
Structural Reform of Transportation Finance .....	19
Outlook for the STIP and SHOPP .....	25
Outlook for the Traffic Congestion Relief Program .....	33
Outlook for the State Aeronautics Program.....	41
Goods Movement.....	47
California Performance Review.....	51
<b>2004 Activity and Accomplishments .....</b>	<b>63</b>
Traffic Congestion Relief Program.....	65
2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).....	75
2004 Report on County and Interregional Share Balances.....	83
2003-04 Project Delivery .....	85
State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP).....	95
Aeronautics Program .....	99
Airspace Advisory Committee.....	103
2004-05 Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program .....	105
Proposition 116 Programs.....	107
State Rail Program .....	111
2004-05 Elderly and Disabled Transit Program .....	115
Seismic Safety Retrofit Program .....	119



## A Message from the Chair

Dear Members of the Legislature:

I am pleased to submit to you the California Transportation Commission's annual report to the Legislature for 2004. State law mandates that the Commission report to you each year identifying timely and relevant transportation issues facing the state and summarizing the Commission's major policy decisions in the past year. The law also mandates that our report summarize the impact of loans from transportation funds to the General Fund.

This year, we must report to you that the state transportation program stands at a crossroads. Our highways are growing ever more congested and our aging road and transit system infrastructure is deteriorating. While our needs for transportation infrastructure expansion and repair are expanding geometrically, we have been reducing our investment to meet these transportation needs dramatically.

This failure to invest in transportation is jeopardizing the future of California's economy, reducing the mobility of both people and goods. It is reducing productivity, increasing user costs, increasing system operating and maintenance costs, and leading to the loss of jobs. In this year alone, the construction work being held back for lack of funding will mean the loss of well over 50,000 jobs.

An effective transportation program requires stable and reliable resources because it usually takes several years of planning, design, and right-of-way work to make a transportation project ready for construction. Until just five years ago, we had a stable program, funded primarily from user fees that were protected by the California Constitution. Today, however, we have a highly unstable program, built primarily on the promise of motor fuel sales tax revenues—revenues that have been held back for each of the last four years to meet General Fund needs. This reliance on funds that may be (and consistently have been) suddenly withdrawn has brought the state transportation program to a breaking point.

We cannot continue to base our planning and project development on resources that never materialize. The viability of the entire program is at stake. This year, the Commission will be adopting the fund estimate for the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which will plan resource investments through 2010-11. Over \$3.6 billion, most of the funding for the STIP, now hinges on the decisions to be made by the Governor and Legislature on the Proposition 42 transfer for 2005-06 and on guarantees for future transportation funding. Without this funding, the Commission will be faced with the prospect of deleting many, perhaps most, projects from the current program.

California's voters have spoken on the importance of funding transportation. In March 2002, Proposition 42 was approved by more than 69% of the voters. In November 2004, voters in seven counties approved local sales tax measures for transportation, each by more than the required  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote.

The Commission looks forward to working with you and the Administration on reconciling the need for dedicated and reliable transportation funding with the need to resolve the State's ongoing structural budget deficit.

Sincerely,

Bob Balgenorth, Chair  
California Transportation Commission



## ISSUES FOR 2005

### Trends and Outlook for State Transportation Financing

*California's  
transportation  
program is in crisis  
and on the verge of  
collapse.*

California's transportation program is in crisis and on the verge of collapse. Where the state once had a transportation program funded almost exclusively from user fees protected by the California Constitution (gasoline taxes and weight fees), we now have a program dependent primarily on motor fuel sales taxes, without constitutional protection. For each of the last 4 years, transportation funds have been taken to close the General Fund deficit. For the last 2 years, the California Transportation Commission has been forced to stop making new allocations to projects from all three of the major components of the state transportation program, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), and the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP). Cities and counties have not been receiving the state subventions committed to them in statute for local road rehabilitation and repair and state transit assistance.

*...the work not going  
to construction this  
year alone will result  
in the loss of well  
over 50,000 jobs.*

In all, these programs account for about \$2.6 billion in state and local transportation projects that should be ready to go to construction this year but will not for lack of funding. Reduced spending on pre-construction work means the delay of billions more in future years. This represents a loss to California's economy in terms of reduced productivity, increased congestion, increased user costs, and increased system operating and maintenance costs. Applying standard economic multipliers, the work not going to construction this year alone will result in the loss of well over 50,000 jobs.

Some projects in the STIP and the TCRP have been kept on schedule by means of borrowing, either through the advancement of funds by local agencies in return for the promise of later repayment or through the Commission's issuance of bonds against future federal transportation fund apportionments. The capacity for such borrowing, however, is reaching its limit as current transportation funding is cut off and future funding is placed in greater doubt. Meanwhile, the backlog of pavement and other rehabilitation needs on the State highway system is growing, and the cost to meet those needs is increasing as more and more work is deferred.



### The Transportation Program in Crisis

*Since June 2003, the Commission has been forced to cease all funding allocations for new STIP projects and to severely restrict SHOPP allocations.*


The STIP and the SHOPP constitute the major part of the State's transportation program. Together, they constitute the planned commitments of state and federal transportation dollars. They are approved by the Commission and developed in cooperation with the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the state's regional transportation planning agencies. The STIP consists of improvements to the State highway system, the intercity rail system, and other road and transit facilities of regional significance. The SHOPP is the program for rehabilitation and safety work on the State highway system that does not involve increases in roadway capacity.

*... STIP projects were able to proceed this year only by borrowing against future STIP funds.*

Since June 2003, the Commission has been forced to cease all funding allocations for new STIP projects and to severely restrict SHOPP allocations. Needed improvements are being delayed, and the rehabilitation backlog is growing, only increasing ultimate costs. By June 2004, \$800 million in STIP and SHOPP projects were either ready to go and placed on the shelf or could have been ready except for the lack of funding. By June 2005, that figure is expected to climb from \$800 million to \$1.3 billion. These figures do not take into account other projects that could have been ready in 2004-05, but were reprogrammed in the 2004 STIP. The 2004 STIP, the five-year plan to guide program allocations from 2004-05 through 2008-09, delayed \$5.4 billion in projects by 2 years or more.

Over \$1.1 billion in scheduled STIP projects were able to proceed this year only by borrowing against future STIP funds. About \$490 million of that borrowing is the advancement of funding by local agencies, with a STIP commitment of repayment at a later date. Another \$658 million is borrowing through State bonding against future federal transportation funding apportionments.

The Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), the other major element of the state transportation program, consists of \$4.9 billion designated for 141 specific projects in the Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000. By law, the program was funded through the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF), which received \$1.6 billion from the General Fund and gasoline sales tax in 2000-01 and was scheduled to receive a series of annual transfers from gasoline sales tax revenues over five years. The Commission allocates funds to the



*Since the program's inception, TCRF funds have been borrowed back for the General Fund and subsequent sales tax transfers have been postponed or suspended.*

*The near elimination of the state transportation construction program over the past two years is unprecedented, the result of a basic structural problem in California's system of transportation financing.*

specific projects as they are ready. Since the program's inception, TCRF funds have been borrowed back for the General Fund and subsequent sales tax transfers have been postponed or suspended. Through 2002, the TCRP was kept intact only by using funds borrowed from the STIP. Throughout 2003 and 2004, the Commission could make no new project allocations at all. By the end of 2004, the Commission had received \$314 million in TCRP allocation requests (including \$132 million for construction projects) that are now being held back for lack of funding. Caltrans and local agencies report that \$1.7 billion in TCRP projects (including \$900 million for construction) will be ready to go by June 2005.

The Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000 also created a program of local subventions to cities and counties for local road rehabilitation and repair. The TCR subvention program was supported in 2000-01 by a \$400 million transfer from the General Fund and was to be supported in later years by a portion of the sales tax on gasoline. For 2001-02 and 2002-03, however, the Legislature postponed the sales tax transfers and instead funded the program with \$350 million in transfers from the State Highway Account that would otherwise have supported the STIP. For 2003-04 and 2004-05, trailer bills to the Budget Act suspended the TCR subvention altogether, eliminating \$392 million for local road rehabilitation and repair.

### Revenues Lost

The near elimination of the state transportation construction program over the past two years is unprecedented, the result of a basic structural problem in California's system of transportation financing. Until a few years ago, the state's transportation programs relied almost exclusively on user fees in the form of gasoline taxes and commercial vehicle weight fees. Article XIX of the California Constitution built a firewall around these revenues, protecting them from diversion for other purposes. In general, this provided a reliable basis for developing multiyear programs, and it could reasonably be assumed that funding would be available as projects were delivered. To be sure, the program went through cycles as funding fell behind delivery or delivery behind funding. The buying power of the revenues declined over time as cars became more fuel efficient, project costs increased with inflation, and gasoline taxes were seldom increased to keep pace. Sometimes earthquakes and other



*As important as the changes and uncertainties in federal revenue may be, their effects on the state transportation program pale by comparison to the impacts of state budget actions in recent years.*

*An effective transportation program cannot survive when resources are suddenly advanced and withdrawn on an annual basis.*

natural disasters diverted dollars for unplanned work. Changes in federal law or policy might also bring about unexpected changes.

To some extent, these factors are still at work. Recent cost increases reported for the toll bridge seismic retrofit program, particularly for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, could lead to the loss of future funding from the STIP, depending on the funding plan approved by the Legislature. Over the last two years, expectations for future federal transportation funding have declined and risen and still remain in doubt. The last six-year federal transportation authorization act expired in September 2003, and the latest temporary extension continues prior funding levels through May 2005. On the other hand, recent federal legislation eliminating the special tax treatment of ethanol-blended gasoline promises the end of another source of revenue loss by 2006.

As important as the changes and uncertainties in federal revenue may be, their effects on the state transportation program pale by comparison to the impacts of state budget actions in recent years. The problems began soon after the enactment of the Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000 (AB 2928). That act not only made promises and commitments that have not been kept, it made the entire state transportation program subject to the vagaries of the annual budget process. The constitutional firewall that had protected transportation funding for decades vanished over the next 3 years.

Transportation projects usually take several years to bring to fruition. Planning and environmental studies, design work, permits and mitigation strategies, and right-of-way acquisition all must precede construction. An effective transportation program cannot survive when resources are suddenly advanced and withdrawn on an annual basis. Further compounding the instability inherent in the TCRP was that many of the 141 designated projects were not vetted through the transportation planning and programming process. Some projects were not deliverable within the original 6-year schedule designated for the program. Many projects were not fully funded, leading either to a skewing of priorities or the wasting of resources. Though some were of high priority, others were not part of any plan supported at either the state or regional level.



*The Traffic  
Congestion Relief  
(TCR) Act of 2000  
committed \$4.9  
billion to the 141  
designated projects...*

*The erosion of this  
major new source of  
transportation  
funding began almost  
immediately.*

### **Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000**

The Traffic Congestion Relief (TCR) Act of 2000 committed \$4.9 billion to the 141 designated projects of the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), with funding originally to be provided through 2005-06, later extended to 2007-08. All \$4.9 billion is funded through the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF) created for that purpose. The TCR Act provided that the TCRF would be funded with:

- \$1.5 billion from the General Fund in 2000-01 (including \$400 million appropriated outside the TCRP for the TCR local road maintenance and repair subvention program).
- \$500 million from the State sales tax on gasoline in 2000-01.
- \$3.314 billion to be transferred from the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF), at the rate of \$678 million per year for 5 years, originally from 2001-02 through 2005-06 and now from 2003-04 through 2007-08.

The TCR Act created the TIF to receive the revenues from the sales tax on gasoline and provided that each quarter, a fixed amount would be transferred to the TCRF, with the balance to be divided by formula, with 40% to cities and counties for local road maintenance and repairs, 40% to the STIP, and 20% to the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Of the 20% for the PTA, half would augment the State Transit Assistance (STA) program, which is distributed by formula to the state's transit operators, and half would augment STIP revenues. The TIF and the transfers to the TCRF were originally to sunset in June 2006.

### **The First Year: 2001-02 Budget and AB 438**

The erosion of this major new source of transportation funding began almost immediately. AB 438, the transportation trailer bill to the 2001-02 Budget Act, borrowed or delayed over \$4.6 billion in transportation funds, including \$1.16 billion in STIP funding either borrowed directly or used to backfill for TCR Act commitments. The General Fund was in trouble, and the stated intent was to borrow the transportation funds without delaying transportation projects. At the time, the three transportation funds (SHA, PTA, and TCRF) held cash balances that were more than enough to meet the short-term cash needs of active STIP and TCRP projects. The TCRP had been jump started





*The borrowing [meant] that projects added in the 2002 STIP would be delayed by several years.*

in 2000-01 with \$1.6 billion, even though most TCRP expenditures were not expected for several years. For the STIP, program funding had been running ahead of program delivery since 1998. That was primarily because of circumstances peculiar to the 1998 and 2000 STIPs that made new funding capacity available earlier than it could be expended. For these reasons, the initial General Fund borrowing could be accommodated without delaying current STIP or TCRP projects. The borrowing, however, did mean that projects added in the 2002 STIP would be delayed by several years.

AB 438 accomplished its borrowing through the following specific actions:

- It suspended implementation of the TIF for two years so that the state sales tax on gasoline would be dedicated to transportation from 2003-04 through 2007-08 rather than from 2001-02 through 2005-06. This retained about \$2.35 billion for the General Fund in 2001-02 and 2002-03.
- It continued funding for the TCR local road subvention program for 2001-02 and 2002-03, funding it with \$350 million from the SHA. The SHA was to be repaid by receiving the 80% rather than 40% of the TIF balance in 2006-07 and 2007-08. This meant that the TCR subvention program would not be funded in the latter two years.
- It authorized money in the TCRF to be loaned to the General Fund through the annual budget act, with loans to be repaid by June 2006. The 2001-02 Budget transferred \$238 million. The 2002-03 Budget transferred another \$1.145 billion, for a total of \$1.383 billion.
- To backfill for the TCRP, it authorized loans of \$275 million from the PTA and \$180 million from the SHA to the TCRF, with SHA loans to be repaid by June 2007 and PTA loans by June 2008. The 2001-02 Budget implemented loans of \$180 million from the PTA and \$180 million from the SHA. The 2002-03 Budget added the other \$95 million from the PTA.

#### **The Second Year: 2002-03 Budget and SB 1834**

The Commission took into account all of the transportation fund borrowing authorized by the AB 438 TCR refinancing package when it adopted the 2002 STIP fund estimate.



*Proposition 42, a legislative constitutional amendment [was] approved by 69 percent of the voters in March 2002...*

*One provision of Proposition 42... was a constitutional bar to suspending transfers to the TIF or using TIF revenues for other purposes.*

However, SB 1834, the transportation trailer bill for the 2002-03 Budget Act, authorized the borrowing of another \$647 million to fill the General Fund deficit, again with the stated intent of doing so without delaying projects. Because SB 1834 and the Budget had not taken the 2002 STIP (adopted in April 2002) into account, this new borrowing meant new project delays, despite the statement of intent. Among SB 1834's specific provisions:

- It increased the authority to make budget loans from the SHA to the TCRF from \$180 million to \$654 million. The \$474 million increase was subject to repayment from the General Fund, with interest, by June 2007. The \$474 million was included in the 2002-03 Budget.
- It authorized the Director of Finance, outside the budget, to order a direct loan of \$173 million from the SHA to the General Fund, under the terms of Article XIX of the California Constitution. A loan in this amount was made in 2002-03 and repaid in 2003-04.

#### **Proposition 42**

Proposition 42, a legislative constitutional amendment approved by 69 percent of the voters in March 2002, removed the June 2008 sunset date for the TIF and permanently dedicated the revenues from the sales tax on gasoline to the purposes already identified in statute. The prior statute, including the TCRP, was continued through 2007-08. Then, beginning with 2008-09, no further funding would be transferred to the TCRF for the TCRP designated projects, and all TIF revenues would be divided by formula, with 40% for local road subventions to cities and counties, 40% for the STIP, and 20% for transfer to the PTA. With half of the PTA augmenting the STIP, one-half of all TIF revenues would accrue to the STIP.

One provision of Proposition 42 that went into effect for 2003-04 was a constitutional bar to suspending transfers to the TIF or using TIF revenues for other purposes. It required a finding by the Governor and the enactment of a bill passed by a two-thirds vote of both houses of the Legislature to suspend or reduce transfers to the TIF for a fiscal year. With a two-thirds vote of both houses, the Legislature could also change the percentages allotted to each purpose (local subventions, STIP, and PTA), but no statute could redirect TIF funds to any other purpose, including the TCRP.



*The protections of Proposition 42 were quickly set aside in 2003-04, the first year they came into effect.*

*The clear message was that Proposition 42 and the TIF, as great as their promise was, could not be relied upon for long-term support of the state transportation program.*

*That message was confirmed this year when the Legislature... [suspended] the Proposition 42 TIF transfer for 2004-05.*

### **The Third Year: 2003-04 Budget, SB 1750, and SB 1751**

The protections of Proposition 42 were quickly set aside in 2003-04, the first year they came into effect. SB 1750 partially suspended the 2003-04 General Fund transfer to the TIF transfer, limiting it to \$289 million for transfer to the TCRF. The balance, estimated at \$856 million, was retained for the General Fund. Of the \$289 million transferred, SB 1751 appropriated \$189 million for the TCRP and directed that \$100 million be transferred to the State Highway Account for expenditure on the STIP as a partial repayment of loans made to the TCRF by the SHA under SB 1834 (2002).

SB 1751 also created the Transportation Deferred Investment Fund (TDIF) and specified that an amount equal to the suspended portion of the 2003-04 TIF transfer, with interest, be transferred to the TDIF by June 2009, with revenue to the TDIF to be available for the same purposes for which the suspended TIF transfer would have been available. The purpose of this was to treat the suspension as a loan, with the repayment not protected by Proposition 42. The clear message was that Proposition 42 and the TIF, as great as their promise was, could not be relied upon for long-term support of the state transportation program.

### **The Fourth Year: 2004-05 Budget, SB 1099, and SB 1098**

That message was confirmed this year when the Legislature enacted SB 1099 to suspend the Proposition 42 TIF transfer for 2004-05, this time in full, retaining \$1.138 billion for the General Fund. A companion bill, SB 1098, treated the suspension as a loan, specifying that an amount equal to the suspended 2004-05 TIF transfer, with interest, be transferred from the General Fund to the TDIF by June 2008, with the TDIF revenue to be available for the same purposes for which the 2004-05 suspended TIF transfer would have been available.

The 2004-05 Budget did provide \$183 million to repay the TCRF for loans to the General Fund. Of this amount, \$43 million was transferred from the General Fund and \$140 million was taken from sales tax revenues that would otherwise have gone to the Public Transportation Account (as part of the "spillover" formula). That reduced STIP revenues by \$70 million and the State Transit Assistance (STA) program for local transit operators by \$70 million. Of the



\$183 million loan repayment to the TCRF, the Budget directed that \$163 million be retained for TCRP projects and that \$20 million be transferred to the State Highway Account for partial repayment of SHA loans to the TCRF.

#### **Using Tribal Casino Bonds to Repay Loans: AB 687**

*AB 687 has added another level of complexity and further uncertainty to the transportation funding picture.*


Another measure affecting transportation funding was enacted this year through AB 687, which ratified tribal casino revenue compacts and provided authority to bond against future state revenues from those and any additional tribal-state compacts, with up to \$1.5 billion in proceeds to be dedicated to the repayment of transportation program loans to the General Fund. AB 687 was ostensibly to be a solution for transportation funding in 2004-05, in effect a replacement for the suspended Proposition 42 transfer. In reality, however, AB 687 has added another level of complexity and further uncertainty to the transportation funding picture. None of the proceeds is yet available. It is not clear when or over what period of time the bonds may be sold, and it is not yet clear what effect potential procedural constraints will have on making the funds available.

*Until [the] legal obstacle is resolved, the bonds cannot be sold.*

No sale of bonds could proceed before the November 2004 election, since the passage of either of two casino revenue initiatives, Proposition 68 and Proposition 70, would have nullified the underlying compacts negotiated by the Governor and ratified by AB 678. The defeat of the initiatives, however, did not resolve the salability of the bonds. A lawsuit filed in September 2004 challenges the ratification of the compacts through urgency legislation, which precluded opponents from petitioning for a referendum against them. Until that legal obstacle is resolved, the bonds cannot be sold.

If those questions are resolved, other issues will remain. Though the language of AB 687 seems to imply that \$1.2 billion would be made available immediately, the State Treasurer has indicated that bond proceeds would likely be closer to \$850 million. In any case, the amount and timing of bond proceeds will depend on several unknowns:

- The resolution of the legal challenge to the ratification of the compacts.
- The timing and magnitude of the underlying casino revenue revenues upon which the tribal-state compact revenues are based.



- The cost of credit enhancements, such as bond insurance. The State Treasurer indicates that this cost is likely to be high because of the unwillingness of the sovereign tribes to make their financial operations a public record.

The authorized bond sale might not occur at one time, but could consist of a series of sales. AB 687 even includes a provision for the compact revenues to be applied directly to transportation if bond sales are determined not to be feasible.

The \$1.5 billion in authorizations for transportation loan repayments are laid out in priority order by AB 687:

- The first \$1.214 billion would go to the TCRF to repay its loan to the General Fund. This amount would be available for use in the following priority order:
  - 1) \$457 million to repay the State Highway Account for its loan to the TCRF. These funds would accrue to the STIP.
  - 2) \$290 million for allocation to TCRP projects.
  - 3) \$384 million to be split with equal priority, with:
    - \$192 million to the PTA to repay part of its loan to the TCRF. These funds would accrue to the STIP.
    - \$192 million to the TCR local streets and roads program, to pay the amount due from the TDIF for that program in 2008-09 as a result of the TIF suspension for 2003-04.
  - 4) \$83 million to the PTA to repay the remainder of its loan to the TCRF. These funds would accrue to the STIP.
  - 5) From any portion of the \$1.214 billion that might remain (e.g., because the higher priority loan repayments are made earlier from other funding), funding of the amount due to the STA program in 2008-09 as a result of the TIF suspension for 2003-04 (about \$47 million).
- The remainder of the \$1.5 billion (no more than \$286 million, unless higher priority loan repayments are made from other funding), would go to the TDIF for payment toward the amount due in 2007-08 as a result of the TIF suspension in 2004-05. The total TDIF due in 2007-08 is about \$1.138 billion (plus interest).
- Any remainder to the TDIF for payment toward the remainder due in 2008-09 as a result of the TIF suspension for 2003-04. This total is about \$909 million



(plus interest), including the amounts identified in items three and five above.

AB 687 further mandates that bonds be exempt, as much as possible, from federal taxation of interest. That should effectively preclude the use of bond proceeds to cover past expenditures, for example by liquidating TCRP letters of no prejudice or STIP cash reimbursements due under AB 3090 arrangements. It will further require that projects to be funded from the proceeds of a bond sale be identified in advance. That may introduce further administrative complexity, especially with regard to the TCR local streets and roads program and the STA program for local transit.

### **Summary of Scheduled Transfers and Loan Repayments**

The following table summarizes the annual Proposition 42 TIF transfers and loan repayments as they are now scheduled. The table includes the original General Fund transfer from 2000-01. The loan repayments now scheduled to be paid from the proceeds of tribal casino revenue bonds pursuant to AB 687 are shown in a separate line.

**Scheduled TIF Transfers and Loan Repayments**  
(\$ millions)

	TCRP	STIP	Loc Rds	STA	Total
Prior Years	\$1,051	-\$ 839	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 212
2003-04	189	100	0	0	289
2004-05	163	20	0	0	183
AB 687	290	732	192	0	1,214
2005-06	678	238	190	48	1,153
2006-07	678	438	0	49	1,164
2007-08	1,280	770	184	106	2,340
2008-09	581	880	512	176	2,149
Total	\$4,910	\$2,338	\$1,078	\$ 378	\$8,704

### **The Commission's Response**

Over the past two years, the Commission has responded to the diversion and loss of transportation funds by suspending new allocations, by monitoring cash flow closely, by encouraging local agencies to advance local funding for projects where they could, by bonding against future federal transportation apportionments to fund a few large projects, and by reprogramming projects in the 2004 STIP, delaying over \$5.4 billion in projects by two years or more.

- In December 2002, the Commission suspended allocations to all STIP, TCRP, and SHOPP projects

*...the Commission has responded to the diversion and loss of transportation funds by suspending new allocations, by monitoring cash flow closely, by encouraging local agencies to advance local funding for projects where they could, by bonding.*



except SHOPP projects for emergency repair, seismic retrofitting, and traffic safety.

- From April to June 2003, the Commission temporarily resumed STIP and SHOPP allocations, following an allocation plan for rationing programmed funding adopted in April. During those months, the Commission approved allocations to \$1 billion of the \$1.4 billion in projects that were ready to go.
- For 2003-04, the Commission once again suspended all STIP and SHOPP allocations except SHOPP projects for emergency repair, seismic retrofitting, and traffic safety. Allocations for other SHOPP were resumed on a limited basis in January 2004. For all of 2003-04, however, the Commission approved no new STIP project allocations and \$800 million in SHOPP, as compared with \$1.3 billion programmed.
- For 2004-05, the Commission continued the suspension of all STIP and SHOPP allocations, except for emergency and safety projects, through January 2005. On the basis of December 2004 cash projections; the Commission now anticipates no more than \$720 million in STIP and SHOPP allocations through June 2005, against over \$2.0 billion programmed, including over \$1.9 billion for the SHOPP. In January 2005, the Commission will consider the extent to which 2004-05 allocations may be extended beyond SHOPP emergency and safety projects.
- The Commission has approved \$455 million in STIP AB 3090 arrangements, under which a local agency advances a project with its own funds and in return receives programming either for cash reimbursement or for a replacement project in a later year.
- The Commission approved the issuance of Grant Anticipation (GARVEE) bonds, secured by future federal transportation apportionments, to cover \$658 million in costs for 8 major STIP projects. The bond issuance was approved in January 2004.
- During 2003, the Commission approved \$269 million in TCRP letters of no prejudice (LONPs). Under an LONP, a local agency implements a TCRP project with its own funds, retaining the option to claim the state TCRP funds dedicated for the project when and if they later become available. Given the uncertainties of TCRP funding, the Commission stopped approving new LONPs in 2004, and



*The outlook for transportation funding in California depends on the resolution of unknowns in four areas: ...toll bridge seismic retrofit... federal reauthorization... legality of the tribal casino revenue bonds... and most important of all... approval or suspension of Proposition 42.*

has since built a backlog of \$590 million in pending but unapproved LONPs.

- In August 2004, the Commission adopted the 2004 STIP, which added two new years (out to 2008-09) and no new project funding capacity. The new STIP reprogrammed \$5.4 billion in projects carried forward from the 2002 STIP, delaying them by an average of two years. In accordance with statute, the fund estimate on which the STIP is based assumed that TIF transfers would proceed as scheduled, without suspension, and that all prior loans would be repaid as scheduled.
- The Commission, together with the Department, continues to monitor the demand and availability of cash flow for STIP, the SHOPP, and the TCRP.

### **Future Outlook**

The outlook for transportation funding in California depends on the resolution of unknowns in four areas: the approval of a revised funding plan for the toll bridge seismic retrofit program by the Legislature; the approval of a federal reauthorization act by Congress and the President; the resolution of the legality of the tribal casino revenue bonds and the determination of cash availability from their proceeds; and, most important of all, the actions of the Legislature with regard to the approval or suspension of Proposition 42 transfers and the repayment of outstanding loans.

In August 2004, Caltrans reported that projected costs for the toll bridge seismic retrofit program (including contingencies) was now \$8.3 billion – about \$3.2 billion more than the funding provided for by AB 1171 (2001). The letting of additional contracts to complete the east span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge is now on hold pending the adoption of a new funding plan by the Legislature. The existing funding plan draws primarily on bridge tolls, state general obligation bonds (Proposition 192), and state transportation revenue drawn from the State Highway Account and the Public Transportation Account. Any further draws on those two accounts would reduce STIP funding already severely at risk.

The last six-year federal transportation authorization act expired September 30, 2003, and its terms have been extended six times, most recently until May 31, 2005. Most





observers now expect the approval of a new authorization act sometime in 2005. By May 2004, both the Senate and House of Representatives had passed six-year reauthorization bills, which would extend federal authorizations to 2008-09. The Senate-passed version would provide \$318 billion in contract authority and the House version \$283 billion, while the White House has opposed any figure over \$256 billion. The White House position roughly equates to the levels assumed for the 2004 STIP fund estimate. House and Senate conferees have yet to complete work on a conference bill to send to the President, though present indications are that there is support for a compromise in the neighborhood of \$299 billion. If enacted and signed by the President, that could provide a 15-20% increase in federal funding over the amount assumed in the fund estimate, or roughly \$2.3 billion overall for California, including \$1.4 billion in additional STIP capacity over the six-year period. The doubt is whether the President will agree to sign a bill approved by Congress or whether the Congress would override a presidential veto.

*More than anything, the future of transportation in California will depend on decisions made by the Governor and the Legislature in the 2005-06 budget process.*

In 2004, the Legislature dedicated up to \$1.5 billion in bond proceeds from tribal casino revenue compacts to repay loans due from the General Fund to various transportation funds. With both the legality of the compact ratifications and the economic viability of the bonds in doubt, it is uncertain when, whether, and how much of these funds will be realized to repay the existing loans. Most troubling is the uncertainty even as to when these questions will be resolved.

*The state transportation program has become largely and increasingly dependent on sales tax revenues.*

More than anything, the future of transportation in California will depend on decisions made by the Governor and the Legislature in the 2005-06 budget process. The state transportation program has become largely and increasingly dependent on sales tax revenues. Under the California Constitution, as amended by Proposition 42, gasoline sales tax revenues are transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund to support both the TCRP and the STIP, as well as local road subventions and the state transit assistance program. Over the last 4 years, however, the scheduled transfers have been postponed or suspended to backfill for General Fund deficits. Of the \$5.4 billion reprogrammed in the 2004 STIP, for example, about \$4.0 billion (75%) was scheduled to come from sales tax revenues - \$3.3 billion from Proposition 42 transfers (including repayments of prior loans) and \$0.7 billion from other sales tax revenues to the PTA, including the sales tax on diesel fuel.



*If the annual TIF transfer is postponed or suspended for the fifth year in a row, it would seem prudent for the Commission to assume... that no TIF transfers will be available... this would mean the virtual collapse of the STIP.*

By law, each STIP fund estimate is adopted on the basis of revenues in existing law. The 2004 STIP fund estimate assumed that Proposition 42 TIF transfers would be made each year and that outstanding loans would be repaid on schedule. In August 2005, the Commission will be adopting the fund estimate for the 2006 STIP (for the 5-year period ending 2010-11). If the annual TIF transfer is postponed or suspended for the fifth year in a row, it would seem prudent for the Commission to assume, on the basis of the record, that no TIF transfers will be available for the STIP. That assumption would mean the loss of over \$3.6 billion to the 2006 STIP. With most, and perhaps all, available State Highway Account funds needed to support safety and rehabilitation work through the SHOPP, this would mean the virtual collapse of the state transportation improvement program.



## ISSUES FOR 2005

### Structural Reform of Transportation Finance

*The crisis in transportation funding, part of the larger and ongoing state budget crisis, has exposed the need and created the opportunity for a major restructuring of transportation finance in California.*

*The state's current financial crisis illustrates how untenable California's current transportation financial structure has become...*

The crisis in transportation funding, part of the larger and ongoing state budget crisis, has exposed the need and created the opportunity for a major restructuring of transportation finance in California. That restructuring should address both the sources of revenue applied to transportation and the relationship of the state budget process to performance and accountability for delivery of the program.

#### Need for Restructuring of Transportation Finance

The state's current financial crisis illustrates how untenable California's current transportation financial structure has become for the long-term maintenance and development of the state's transportation system. The state needs a transportation program supported by a stable and reliable source of revenue that can keep pace with California's needs. The Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000 and Proposition 42, despite the promise they held when enacted, have simply not worked. A transportation program that depends on volatile or unreliable funding sources can only be a dysfunctional program. Even when the state's economic fortunes improve, the current statutory dedication of gasoline sales tax revenues for transportation will not provide the long-range reliability needed to plan and implement projects that require years to develop.

In hindsight, it appears that the diversion of a portion of the sales tax to transportation has contributed to the state's overall structural budget deficit. To remedy that deficit will require either:

- 1) an increase in the general sales tax or other taxes to make up for the dedication to transportation;
- 2) reductions in non-transportation programs to make up for the dedication to transportation;
- 3) permanent reductions in transportation investment to return the sales taxes to non-transportation programs, or
- 4) the establishment of an alternative financial structure for transportation while returning the sales taxes to non-transportation programs.



*California needs a transportation financial structure that guarantees a stable and reliable source of funding...*

*Proposition 42 promised a boost in state transportation funding that was much needed... In fact, 75% of the funding needed to support... the 2004 STIP would come from sales tax revenues.*

The postponements, loans, and suspensions of the last four years all point to the third option, reductions in the transportation program, even while promising that the funds would be returned at a later date. Without a change in overall program structure, making the scheduled Proposition 42 transfers and transportation loan repayments would almost surely mean choosing between the first two options, increasing other taxes or cutting other programs, a most unpalatable choice for the Legislature. Even the prospective use of tribal casino bond proceeds to repay transportation loans, as welcome as it might be, has introduced one more element of volatility and uncertainty to the state transportation funding structure.

In order to meet the state's growing needs for maintaining, rebuilding, and improving transportation, California needs a transportation financial structure that guarantees a stable and reliable source of funding across the years, preferably a structure under which revenues can rise with construction costs and needs. Historically, California's state transportation program has relied most heavily on fuel taxes and commercial vehicle weight fees, with inviolable protections built into Article XIX of the California Constitution. When revenues from these state sources failed to keep pace with needs, 19 counties representing 87% of the state's population enacted local transportation sales tax measures. In November 2004, voters in 7 of the 9 counties with ballot measures for new or renewed transportation sales taxes, approved them by more than the required 2/3 vote. Revenues from all of these measures are protected from non-transportation uses by authorizing statutes, by local voter-approved ordinances, and by the terms of bond covenants.

Proposition 42 promised a boost in state transportation funding that was much needed, even if relatively modest. It promised about \$1.2 billion per year, roughly equivalent to a gasoline tax of 7 cents per gallon. With half of the revenue in future years dedicated to the STIP, it would have allowed the STIP to be maintained at levels roughly equal to earlier years. The new revenue would have mostly made up for growing rehabilitation needs on the State highway system, growth in travel, and the steadily declining revenue per mile from the existing per-gallon gasoline tax. In fact, 75% of the funding needed to support the \$5.4 billion reprogrammed in the 2004 STIP would come from sales tax revenues. Proposition 42 also promised an important though modest increase in funding for local road rehabilitation, where the



*...the Commission urgently recommends that the Legislature take action that will assure a steady and reliable structure for the multiyear financing of transportation capital improvements in California...*

*The current state transportation financial structure also lacks the kind of accountability needed to ensure that funding is spent effectively.*

Commission's SR 8 study of 1999 found an unfunded backlog of over \$10 billion in needs, growing at an annual rate of \$400 million per year.

While increasing the gasoline tax, with its Article XIX protection, may be the simplest means for funding the state transportation program, there are other options that might be considered. The constitution could be amended to afford the gasoline sales tax the same protections now provided the per-gallon tax under Article XIX, although that would likely lead to one of the first two options described above, either an increase in other taxes or cuts in other programs. The state could explore new means of tolling highways and bonding against toll revenues. A gasoline tax increase could be implemented directly by the Legislature or conditioned upon voter approval (as was done with Proposition 111 when the gasoline tax was last raised, in 1989). Gasoline taxes could be enacted incrementally or indexed. In any case, the Commission urgently recommends that the Legislature take action that will assure a steady and reliable structure for the multiyear financing of transportation capital improvements in California, including the rehabilitation and reconstruction of existing facilities.

#### **Program Delivery Performance and Accountability**

The current state transportation financial structure also lacks the kind of accountability needed to ensure that funding is spent effectively. The current financing and budgeting system involves no measurement of project delivery and management performance, discourages innovation to achieve performance goals, and diffuses program accountability. Because of the length of time required to develop transportation capital projects and bring them to fruition, the uncertainties and constraints imposed by an annual budget cycle and the imposition of rules intended for the operation of General Fund agencies add costs and time to an already lengthy process.

This inattention to performance and results seriously handicaps transportation policy and decision-making. The ordinary budgeting process, based on a review of year-to-year adjustments, impairs the ability of policymakers and managers to impose or adapt to new priorities. Transportation financing and budgeting should be focused instead on results and ensuring accountability for achieving results.



*The Commission recommends that the Legislature reform the budget process as it applies to the transportation capital outlay program, including capital outlay support.*

*The focus of the budget should instead be on performance in delivery of the state transportation program...*

*Under the leadership of the Secretary... Caltrans has recently developed... transportation system performance measures that should provide a useful basis for setting program goals and measuring outcomes.*

The Commission recommends that the Legislature reform the budget process as it applies to the transportation capital outlay program, including capital outlay support. Without compromising the Legislature's oversight authority, the focus of the process should be shifted from budget controls to performance objectives, from annual budget change increments to multiyear program goals. Budgets based on program outcomes should replace the focus on positions, classifications, and dollars by fund source. Such budget controls can reduce or eliminate a manager's ability to respond to changing conditions and to take advantage of opportunities to deliver the program more effectively. Under the current process, key decisions affecting the delivery of the state transportation program are too often driven by control agencies rather than by transportation policy makers in the Administration, at the Commission, or in the Legislature.

The focus of the budget should instead be on performance in delivery of the state transportation program, which is developed by state and regional agencies under the structure created in state law. Under the leadership of the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, Caltrans has recently developed and is now testing a set of transportation system performance measures that should provide a useful basis for setting program goals and measuring outcomes. The system was designed by the Department in collaboration with a team of transportation stakeholders, including Commission staff and representatives from the Federal Highway Administration, regional agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, transit operating agencies, local transportation agencies, and the Commission's Rural Counties Task Force. The team built on earlier efforts by the Department and metropolitan planning organizations—most notably the Southern California Association of Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. In July 2004, the Department published a report summarizing and outlining the team's recommendations for measuring performance outcomes in nine areas:

1. Coordinated transportation and land use.
2. Economic development.
3. Environmental quality.
4. Equity.
5. Mobility, reliability, and accessibility.
6. Productivity.



7. Return on investment.
8. Safety.
9. System preservation.

Caltrans is now using these recommendations to develop a prototype “state of the system” report to use as a model for future annual system reports. The prototype, scheduled for completion in January 2005, will be used to solicit stakeholder feedback on content, structure, format, and presentation of data. Development of the prototype will help the Department to organize and communicate information, to identify and understand target audiences and their needs, to define and clarify data collection roles and responsibilities, to define and clarify data aggregation levels and analysis timeframes, and to identify data gaps and close them. The preparation and completion of the first annual state of the system report would follow later in 2005.



## ISSUES FOR 2005

### Outlook for the STIP and SHOPP

In August 2004, the Commission adopted the 2004 STIP, adding two new program years (through 2008-09) and no new programming capacity. Constrained by the 2004 STIP fund estimate, projects from the 2002 STIP were rescheduled, with most of them delayed by two years or more. The schedule of projects in the 2004 STIP includes:

**2004 STIP Programming by Year**  
(\$ millions)

	Prior Yr	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Total
GARVEE bond debt service	\$ 0	\$ 68	\$ 73	\$ 73	\$ 73	\$ 73	\$ 359
AB 3090 cash payments	0	18	44	125	76	70	332
Caltrans environmental, design	625	5	35	24	16	24	730
Caltrans R/W, including support	661	3	132	110	122	10	1,038
Caltrans construction	0	68	905	769	659	898	3,299
Local projects, Caltrans rail	0	60	390	255	343	363	1,395
Enhancement (TE) projects	0	73	122	69	71	64	407
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,286</b>	<b>\$295</b>	<b>\$1,701</b>	<b>\$1,426</b>	<b>\$1,360</b>	<b>\$1,503</b>	<b>\$7,571</b>

The program year represents the year project funding is scheduled for allocation, not the year in which cash is expended. In the case of Caltrans environmental, design, and right-of-way (which are not allocated to individual projects by the CTC), it represents the year in which work is scheduled to begin.

The \$7.6 billion STIP total includes \$1.286 billion in Caltrans environmental, design, and right-of-way costs programmed in prior years for projects that remain in the STIP and have not yet been allocated funds for construction. It also includes \$359 million in GARVEE bond debt service payments scheduled through the STIP period, \$332 million in scheduled AB 3090 cash reimbursements, and \$407 million in Transportation Enhancement (TE) projects and reserves. TE projects are funded from federal TE funds, which can be used only for this purpose. The \$4.7 billion remainder of the STIP is programmed for allocation to Caltrans construction (including construction support) and local agency projects (excluding TE).

Of the \$4.7 billion scheduled for STIP project allocations, just \$128 million was scheduled for the new STIP's first year, 2004-05, with another \$1.295 billion scheduled for 2005-06. The STIP adoption also set aside \$65 million in





*With STIP capacity severely restricted for 2004-05, many projects that were already delivered or that could be ready in 2004-05 were programmed in later years.*

program capacity for 2004-05 to allocate the non-federal match for GARVEE bonding that might be approved in 2004-05. With STIP capacity severely restricted for 2004-05, many projects that were already delivered or that could be ready in 2004-05 were programmed in later years.

Among the major STIP projects programmed for allocation in 2004-05 or 2005-06 are:

- Amador. Route 88 passing lanes, Pine Grove.
- Butte. Route 149 4-lane expressway, Route 70 to Route 99.
- Colusa. Route 20 passing lanes, Steer Ditch Bridge to Sycamore.
- Contra Costa. Route 80 westbound HOV lane, Carquinez Bridge to Route 4, and Route 680 auxiliary lane, Danville/San Ramon.
- El Dorado. Route 50 operational improvements, Placerville.
- Fresno. Route 99 widening, Kingsburg to Selma.
- Glenn. Route 32 realignment, Orland.
- Kern. Route 178 Fairfax Road interchange, Route 14 widening north of Mojave, and Westside Parkway, Phase 1.
- Lassen. Skyline Road improvements.
- Los Angeles. MTA light rail vehicles, Route 5 Western Avenue interchange in Glendale, Route 134 Hollywood Way interchange in Burbank; Route 138 widening at Twin Bridges; Route 60 HOV lanes, Route 605 to Azusa Avenue.
- Madera. Route 99 freeway at Fairmead.
- Marin. Route 101 reversible HOV lanes.
- Merced. Route 99 freeway at Livingston and at Mission Avenue interchange.
- Orange. Route 90 Imperial Highway grade separation near Orangethorpe; Route 5 HOV lanes, Route 91 to Los Angeles County Line.
- Placer. Route 49 improvements, Route 80 to Dry Creek Road.
- Riverside. Route 60 HOV lanes, Route 15 to Valley Way.
- Sacramento. Traffic operating system, Routes 5 and 80
- San Bernardino. Route 215 HOV lanes, Route 10 to Route 30; Route 10 widening, Orange St to Ford St.
- San Diego. Route 905 Otay Mesa freeway.
- San Joaquin. Route 5 widening, Mossdale.
- San Luis Obispo. Route 41/101 interchange, Atascadero.
- San Mateo. Route 101 auxiliary lanes, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave to Millbrae Ave.
- Santa Barbara. Route 101 6-lane freeway, Santa Maria.
- Santa Clara. Route 152/156 interchange improvements.
- Santa Cruz. Route 1/17 connector.
- Shasta. Cypress Avenue Sacramento River bridge; downtown Redding improvements on Routes 273 and 299.
- Solano. Route 80 westbound HOV lane, Route 29 to Carquinez Bridge.
- Sonoma. Route 101 HOV lanes, Route 12 to Steele Lane, and Steele Lane interchange.
- Stanislaus. Route 132 widening, Riverside Drive to Empire.
- Sutter. Route 99 widening, Route 70 to Garden Highway.



- Trinity. Hyampom Road realignment at Hayfork.
- Tulare. Road 80 expressway, Goshen to El Monte Way (right-of-way).
- Ventura. Route 23 widening, Route 118 to Route 101, and Tunnel 26 seismic improvements on Metrolink.

### **Near-Term Outlook for STIP Funding**

As required by statute, the 2004 STIP was based on the STIP fund estimate adopted in December 2003. That fund estimate assumed, among other things, that the STIP would receive gasoline sales tax revenues each year through Proposition 42 Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) transfers. It also assumed that the STIP would receive a \$464 million loan repayment for the State Highway Account in 2006-07 and a \$275 million loan repayment for the Public Transportation Account (PTA) in 2007-08. The capacity to make allocations in any given year depends not only on the program revenues available that year, but also on the revenues expected for the following two years, when most of the project expenditures will actually occur.

*The prospects for funding STIP projects as programmed for 2004-05 and 2005-06 have been dimmed by the suspension of the Proposition 42 transfer for 2004-05...*

*...the Commission now anticipates capacity to allocate no more than \$720 million for STIP and SHOPP projects in 2004-05, against over \$2.0 billion programmed...*

The prospects for funding STIP projects as programmed for 2004-05 and 2005-06 have been dimmed by the suspension of the Proposition 42 transfer for 2004-05, a direct loss of about \$230 million in STIP revenues. Under legislation tied to the suspension, the suspension was to be treated as a loan, with the lost revenue to be replaced through the Transportation Deferred Investment Fund (TDIF) in 2008-09. As another part of the 2004-05 budget package, AB 687 dedicated tribal casino bond revenues to advancing the repayment of the SHA and PTA loans due in 2006-07 and 2007-08. The net result of the suspension, the TDIF loan, and the AB 687 payments would have been to make some STIP revenues available earlier than anticipated by the fund estimate (an increase of \$522 million in 2004-05, with \$477 million advanced from 2006-07 and \$45 million from 2007-08). However, all but \$20 million of the \$522 million was tied to the tribal casino revenue bond sale, which is now under a legal cloud. A lawsuit filed in September 2004 challenged the legality of the Legislature's ratification of the tribal compacts, and the bonds cannot be sold until the legal issues are resolved.

Through December 2004, the Commission had made no STIP allocations (except for TE projects). On the basis of cash projections updated in December 2004, the Commission now anticipates capacity to allocate no more than



\$720 million for STIP and SHOPP projects in 2004-05, against over \$2.0 billion programmed, including over \$1.9 billion for the SHOPP. In January 2005, the Commission will consider the extent to which any of this limited capacity should be made available for STIP projects.

### **GARVEE Bonding**

Under state and federal law, the Commission may select some projects from the STIP and SHOPP to be funded from the proceeds of federal grant anticipation (GARVEE) bonds, a form of borrowing against future federal funding for the STIP. The Commission approved the first issuance of GARVEE bonds in January 2004 for \$658 million for eight projects from the 2002 STIP.

GARVEE bond proceeds can cover only the federally-funded portion of a project's cost (generally 88.5%). GARVEE bonding in California is structured so that the state's future federal transportation apportionments cover all debt service payments. This requires that the entire nonfederal portion of project cost (including costs of issuance and interest) be provided during the construction period on a pay-as-you-go basis. In adopting the 2004 STIP, the Commission set aside \$65 million as a reserve to provide the nonfederal match.

*The Commission's ability... to proceed with the [GARVEE] bonding, will depend on tribal casino revenue bonds.*

After receiving information and proposals from the Department and regional agencies, the Commission identified 6 projects with programmed costs of \$312 million for potential GARVEE bonding in 2004-05. The Commission's ability to provide the nonfederal match, and thus to proceed with the bonding, will depend on the receipt of revenues from the AB 687 tribal casino revenue bonds. The GARVEE projects identified in a STIP amendment presented at the December 2004 Commission meeting include:



# **GARVEE Bonding STIP Amendment, December 2004**

(\$1,000's)

PPNO	County	Rte	Project	GARVEE	Nonfederal Match	
					TCRP	STIP
16W	Butte	149	4-lane expressway, Route 70-Route 99	\$ 70,000	\$ 0	\$12,500
261F	Contra Costa	80	Westbound HOV lanes, Rte 4-Carquinez Br	16,649	0	3,287
1530	Fresno	99	6-lane freeway, Kingsburg-Selma	29,880	20,000	0
2808A	Los Angeles	5	Carmenita Av interchange, right-of-way	81,494	71,000	0
7965B	San Joaquin	205	6-lane freeway, Route 5-11 <sup>th</sup> Street	67,000	25,000	0
789A	Sonoma	101	HOV lanes, Route 12-Steele Lane	41,327	6,000	2,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$306,350</b>	<b>\$122,000</b>	<b>\$17,787</b>

## **AB 3090 Advancements**

It is the Commission's policy to encourage local agencies who wish to use local funds to advance the delivery of projects programmed in the STIP when state funds are not sufficient to support direct project allocations. Under AB 3090 (1992), the Commission may approve an arrangement under which the local agency is programmed to receive either an undesignated replacement project or a cash reimbursement in a later fiscal year. Replacement projects are subject to reprogramming as funding conditions change, and so uncertainty in future funding creates a risk for the local agency. Cash reimbursements, on the other hand, represent another form of borrowing against the future. The reimbursements cannot be changed and have the highest priority, after GARVEE bond debt service, for any STIP capacity available in the year reimbursement is due. The local agency takes some risk that no STIP capacity may be available to make the reimbursement. The greater risk, however, is to the proponents of every other project programmed in the state. For this reason, the Commission's policy is to give preference to replacement projects wherever feasible. Generally, reimbursements are considered only where the source of local funds could not or would not be made available for an AB 3090 replacement project.

*Uncertainty in the availability of future STIP funding may reduce the willingness of local agencies to advance STIP projects...*

The Commission's policy is to ensure that the annual programming of cash reimbursements is no more than \$200 million statewide and no more than \$50 million for any single county. At the close of 2004, the Commission already had AB 3090 cash commitments of \$125 million for 2006-07, \$76 million for 2007-08, and \$70 million for 2008-09.

Uncertainty in the availability of future STIP funding may reduce the willingness of local agencies to advance STIP projects in return for the promise of a replacement project at an uncertain future date. The uncertainty of future funding



also makes it more problematic for the Commission to approve an AB 3090 cash reimbursement, knowing that insufficient funding will mean that other projects will be delayed in order to provide the reimbursement.

### **Outlook for the 2006 STIP and SHOPP**

Notwithstanding the cash flow challenges for the 2004 STIP, the 2006 STIP and SHOPP could have a modest level of capacity for new project commitments in 2009-10 and 2010-11,

- if added toll bridge seismic retrofit costs are not taken from existing STIP revenues,
- if the federal reauthorization act meets prior expectations,
- if the Governor and Legislature do not suspend Proposition 42 transfers, and
- if transportation loans are repaid on time.

Assuming the programming capacity identified in the 2004 STIP fund estimate, making adjustments for the recent federal ethanol fix and the impacts of the 2004-05 state budget, and projecting current revenue estimates into 2009-10 and 2010-11 yields the following rough estimate of potential new capacity for the 2006 STIP and SHOPP:

#### **Projection of Potential New 2006 STIP/SHOPP Capacity** (\$ millions)


\$1,672	State Highway Account, 2009-10 and 2010-11
<u>146</u>	Less committed GARVEE debt service, 2009-10, 2010-11
\$1,526	Net new capacity, State Highway Account
1,300	Proposition 42 TIF transfers, 2009-10 and 2010-11
<u>140</u>	Public Transportation Account, 2009-10 and 2010-11
<b>\$2,966</b>	<b>Potential 2006 STIP/SHOPP capacity projection</b>

This is not a STIP forecast or estimate. It is but a rough estimate of the capacity potential for both the STIP and SHOPP if all current revenue sources remain intact and are projected into the future. It assumes that annual TIF transfers will resume and that all loans to the General Fund are repaid. The funding of additional SHOPP needs (perhaps \$1-2 billion) will need to be considered as part of the 2006 STIP fund estimate and would have to come from this capacity. The 2006 STIP fund estimate will cover the five-year period from 2006-07 through 2010-11 and govern both the 2006 STIP and the 2006 SHOPP.

However, over \$3.6 billion of 2006 STIP capacity is at risk if there is no fix for the structural imbalance in the state budget...

*The funding of additional SHOPP needs (perhaps \$1-2 billion) will need to be considered as part of the 2006 STIP fund estimate...*

*...over \$3.6 billion of 2006 STIP capacity is at risk if there is no fix for the structural imbalance in the state budget...*



and if transportation funds are not protected by the California Constitution. The amount at risk includes:

#### STIP Transfers at Risk

(\$ millions)

\$ 238	Prop 42 TIF transfer, 2005-06
438	Prop 42 TIF transfer, 2006-07
540	Prop 42 TIF transfer, 2007-08
230	TDIF transfer, 2007-08 (repayment for 2004-05 TIF suspension)
620	Prop 42 TIF transfer, 2008-09
260	TDIF transfer, 2008-09 (repayment for 2003-04 TIF suspension)
640	Prop 42 TIF transfer, 2009-10
<u>660</u>	Prop 42 TIF transfer, 2010-11
<b>\$3,626</b>	<b>Total STIP gasoline sales tax transfers at risk</b>

*Without [a] budget fix or constitutional protection, the Commission faces a 2006 STIP in which no new projects are added and many, perhaps most, current projects are deleted.*

These figures illustrate the importance of correcting the state budget structural imbalance or protecting transportation funds from the annual budget process. Without that budget fix or constitutional protection, the Commission faces a 2006 STIP in which no new projects are added and many, perhaps most, current projects are deleted. The decision on Proposition 42 transfers for 2005-06 will drive the 2006 STIP fund estimate and have implications for the long-term viability of the program.

*The decision on Proposition 42 transfers for 2005-06 will drive the 2006 STIP fund estimate and have implications for the long-term viability of the program.*

In the absence of funding protection, an alternative approach to the 2006 STIP would be to develop a tiered STIP, with one tier based on the funding level that can be assumed with some level of confidence and the other based on at-risk funding. In that case, the first tier would delete many or most projects and delay the rest by two years or more. The second tier could hold project schedules and add new projects for 2009-10 and 2010-11. This approach might paint the clearest picture of the effects of uncertainty on the state transportation program. But the uncertainty hardly meets the statutory intent for the STIP in SB 45 (1997), to be “a resource document to assist the state and local entities to plan and implement transportation improvements and to utilize available resources in a cost-effective manner.”



## ISSUES FOR 2005

### Outlook for the Traffic Congestion Relief Program

*The program has a history of promises unfulfilled, and it has been faced with unstable funding and an uncertain future ever since it was first created.*

The Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) consists of the 141 specific projects that were designated by the Governor and the Legislature for \$4.9 billion in the Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000. The program has a history of promises unfulfilled, and it has been faced with unstable funding and an uncertain future ever since it was first created. Funds originally intended for the program have been repeatedly withheld, postponed, or borrowed for the General Fund. At one point, in November 2003, the Governor actually proposed to repeal the program altogether. The Commission has not been able to approve any new allocations for TCRP projects since December 2002, and the Legislature has provided just enough funding over the last 2 years to continue reimbursements for projects already allocated.

In mid-2004, the Governor and Legislature approved the dedication of proceeds from tribal casino revenue bonds to the repayment of transportation loans, with \$290 million to be made available for the TCRP. The bonds, however, are tied up in litigation, and the prospects for new TCRP funding this year remain highly uncertain.

The TCRP is funded through the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF), which was created by the TCR Act for that purpose. The TCRP was scheduled to be funded through the TCRF with:

- \$1.595 billion in 2000-01 from a General Fund transfer and directly from gasoline sales tax revenue.
- \$3.314 billion in transfers from the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF), originally scheduled in statute over the years from 2001-02 through 2005-06, and now scheduled from 2003-04 through 2007-08. The transfers were to be \$678 million per year for the first four years and the balance of \$602 million in the fifth year. The TIF derives its revenues from the sales tax on gasoline.

The original \$4.9 billion commitment was to be funded entirely from the General Fund and gasoline sales tax. To date, however, progress on TCRP projects has been slowed by the continuing uncertainty over program funding. Most of



the state funds expended on the TCRP have actually come from funds diverted from the STIP.

### **Program Status**

By December 2004:

- The California Transportation Commission had approved \$3.841 billion in TCRP project applications, including at least one application for each of the 141 designated projects. An application defines the scope, cost, and schedule of a particular project or project phase. Application approval is equivalent to project programming and generally includes project expenditures planned for future years.
- Of the \$3.841 billion in application approvals, the Commission had approved \$1.494 billion in project allocations. An allocation encumbers state funding for a particular project or project phase.
- Of the \$1.494 billion allocated, \$1.116 billion had been expended and invoiced.
- The Commission had received another \$314 million in allocation requests and had received a report from Caltrans that another \$1.7 billion in projects would be ready for allocation in 2004-05.
- The Commission had approved \$269 million in letters of no prejudice (LONPs). Under a letter of no prejudice, a local agency may expend its own funds on a project and qualify for later reimbursement when and if funds become available.
- The Commission had received another \$595 million in requested LONPs, which it had placed on a pending list, without approval.

*The Commission has not made any new project allocations since December 2002...*

The Commission has not made any new project allocations since December 2002, when it became evident that TCRF revenues might not be sufficient to fund the TCRP allocations that had already been approved, much less to fund additional allocations. At that point, the Governor had proposed to suspend General Fund transfers to the TIF, and thus TIF transfers to the TCRF, to help close the General Fund deficit. Since then, the Governor and Legislature have suspended scheduled TIF transfers and provided just enough to continue funding existing TCRP allocations.





### **Program Challenges and Opportunities**

*The funding outlook for the TCRP in 2005 and later years will depend on whether or not the Governor and Legislature decide to continue suspending scheduled Proposition 42 TIF transfers, and whether and when loan repayments due to the TCRP are made.*

The funding outlook for the TCRP in 2005 and later years will depend on whether or not the Governor and Legislature decide to continue suspending scheduled Proposition 42 TIF transfers, and whether and when loan repayments due to the TCRP are made. At present, the scheduled transfers and loan repayments due to the TCR include:

#### **TCRP Scheduled transfers and loan repayments**

(\$ millions)

\$ 290	Tribal casino bond proceeds (AB 687)
678	Proposition 42 TIF transfer, 2005-06
678	Proposition 42 TIF transfer, 2006-07
602	Proposition 42 TIF transfer, 2007-08
678	TDIF transfer, 2007-08, repayment of suspended 2004-05 TIF transfer
389	TDIF transfer, 2008-09, repayment of suspended 2003-04 TIF transfer
192	TDIF transfer, 2008-09, AB 687 shift of TCRF to local road program

**\$3,507 Total revenues due, Traffic Congestion Relief Program**

The annual TIF transfers (\$1.958 billion) are covered by Article XIX B of the California Constitution, added by Proposition 42 (2002). Under Proposition 42, the transfer may be suspended for a fiscal year only if a fiscal emergency is declared by the Governor and is approved by a 2/3 vote of each house of the Legislature in a bill separate from the annual budget act. In 2003-04, the TIF transfer was partially suspended, and in 2004-05, it was fully suspended. Each time, the Legislature treated the suspension as a loan, with the repayment to be made through the Transportation Deferred Investment Fund (TDIF) in a future year. These future TDIF payments (\$1.259 billion) are not covered by the constitutional protection of Proposition 42.

### **Tribal Casino Revenue Bonds, AB 687**

In mid-2004, the Governor negotiated tribal compacts that were ratified by the Legislature in AB 687. AB 687 also authorized the issuance of bonds against state revenues from tribal casino revenue to repay up to \$1.5 billion in transportation loans. Of the first \$1.214 billion in proceeds, \$290 million would be dedicated to the TCRP. If proceeds exceed \$1.214 billion, the remainder (up to \$286 million) would be used to repay the TDIF payment due in 2007-08 as a result of the TIF suspension in 2004-05.

The sale of the authorized bonds was at first delayed by Propositions 68 and 70, two casino revenue initiatives on the November 2004 ballot. Passage of either would have



effectively nullified the compacts. Both initiatives were defeated. However, the bonds face other legal hurdles and are more complicated than typical state borrowings.

The tribal casino bonds face a legal challenge from *Glendon B. Craig, et al v. Arnold Schwarzenegger et al*, which challenges the urgency provision of AB 687. The plaintiffs contend that AB 687, which ratified the gaming compacts, grants geographic monopolies to the tribes, thereby violating a provision of the California Constitution that bars the Legislature from granting any special privilege or franchise in an urgency statute. Until the legal challenge is resolved, the bonds will not be sold. That places the timing and availability of this \$290 million in doubt.

### **Program Outlook for 2005**

During the 2004-05 budget hearings, the Commission was asked to develop the cash needs for a series of options ranging from closing out the TCRP to funding it fully. Based upon the information received from regional agencies, the implementing agencies, and Caltrans, the Commission estimated that the following cash transfers would be needed, assuming that new TCRP allocations were not restricted:

#### **Estimated TCRP Cash Needed to Meet Project Schedules** (\$ millions)


	Cash in 2004-05	Cash in 2005-06
For prior allocations	\$163	\$ 65
For existing letters of no prejudice	6	113
New non-construction allocations	197	254
New construction allocations	132	329
<b>Total cash needs</b>	<b>\$498</b>	<b>\$761</b>

*...\$290 million in TCRP funding anticipated from the tribal casino bonding... would clearly be insufficient to meet... project cash demands for 2004-05, even if it becomes available.*

Additional cash needs were estimated at \$866 million for 2006-07 and \$1.546 billion for later years.

The 2004-05 budget provided only the \$163 million need to support current expenditures on projects with prior allocations. The additional \$290 million in TCRP funding anticipated from the tribal casino bonding authorized under AB 687 would clearly be insufficient to meet the remaining TCRP project cash demands for 2004-05, even if it becomes available. If it does become available, the Commission will need to determine TCRP priorities for applying the bond proceeds.

Current Commission policy is that up to one-half of any new TCRP allocations would be dedicated to retiring existing



*If... \$290 million becomes available for new allocations... The Commission will look to the Governor and Legislature for guidance.*

LONPs. AB 687, however, specifies that the interest on the bonds shall, to the greatest extent feasible, be exempt from federal taxation. To qualify for the tax exemption, the bond proceeds generally cannot be used to reimburse prior capital expenditures. That would effectively preclude their use to retire LONPs.

Whether any new capacity comes from the tribal casino bonds or from other transfers, the Commission will need to consider whether it can or should assume that additional funding will follow. Projects allocated funds in any one year will generally expend funds over an average of three years. If, for example, \$290 million becomes available for new allocations, the Commission would need to decide whether to

- limit its allocations to \$290 million, because future transfers are not assured, or
- allocate more than the \$290 million, because the \$290 million would be sufficient to cover first-year expenditures, and assuming that sufficient future transfers would be made to cover expenditure needs in later years.

The Commission will look to the Governor and Legislature for guidance. The history of the program suggests the more conservative approach unless the Governor and Legislature provide assurance of their intent that the Commission assume that future transfers and repayments will be made as scheduled. The first approach would allow a relatively small number of TCRP projects to proceed, while leaving a larger number of projects to be held in abeyance, either to be completed with lengthy delays while local and other funds are secured or to be truncated to match other funding available. The latter approach could allow perhaps \$1 billion in projects to be started, with the remaining funds to come from later transfers.

The continuing uncertainty in funding for the TCRP makes it difficult for the Commission, the Department, regional agencies, and local implementing agencies to plan, program, and implement TCRP projects. The delivery outlook for TCRP projects depends largely on the confidence of implementing agencies that transfers and repayments to the TCRF will actually occur as scheduled. The continuing postponements and suspensions of TIF and TCRF transfers, the suspensions of TCRP project allocations, and the threat that current allocations might not be reimbursed have all worked to erode that confidence. For most projects, the




*The history of suspended transfers and TCRF loans indicates that the TCRF is a vulnerable and unreliable source of project funding.*

*Without some assurance that TCRP funding will become available, it is likely that some of these projects will be delayed further or dropped altogether.*

TCRP commitment provides only a portion of the project's cost, requiring that a funding package be assembled that includes other sources. In many cases, project delivery depends on the willingness and ability of an individual agency to provide other funding sources to keep a project alive and moving.

The history of suspended transfers and TCRF loans indicates that the TCRF is a vulnerable and unreliable source of project funding. Generally, the projects that are proceeding are those sponsored by agencies that are the least reliant on TCRF funding for reimbursement. As of December 2004, the Commission had approved \$269 million in TCRP letters of no prejudice (LONPs). Another \$595 million in LONPs is pending Commission action. Other agencies have proceeded with TCRP projects using STIP funds, hoping to recover the TCRF funding at a later date. At the same time, the Commission is holding \$314 million in TCRP allocation requests, waiting for assurance that funding will be sufficient to proceed with them. In December 2004, Caltrans reported that another \$1.7 billion in projects should be ready for allocation in 2004-05 (including \$869 million ready for construction). Without some assurance that TCRP funding will become available, it is likely that some of these projects will be delayed further or dropped altogether.

The following tables list the TCRP projects identified by Caltrans as either ready now or to be ready by June 2005:



**Traffic Congestion Relief Program  
Construction Projects Ready in 2004-05**  
(\$1,000's)

#	Project Description	New 2004-05 Allocation	Pending STIP Allocation	STIP FY
9.2	Capitol Corridor; improve between Oakland and San Jose (Emeryville station)	\$ 2,925		
26	ACE Commuter Rail; add siding on UPRR line in Livermore Valley in Alameda Co.	1,000	\$ 1,000	07/08
27.1	Vasco Rd, Alameda & Contra Costa (Vasco Rd re-alignment)	6,350	1,400	08/09
27.2	Vasco Rd, Alameda & Contra Costa (Vasco Rd ACE parking)	1,204		
28	Parking Structure at Transit Village at Richmond BART Station	4,320	2,000	06/07
32.5	North Coast Railroad; environmental remediation projects	2,954		
35.2	Pacific Surfliner; triple track intercity rail line within Los Angeles County	66,936		
35.3	Pacific Surfliner; fifth lead track, Los Angeles County	4,675		
37.1	Los Angeles Mid-City Transit Improvements; Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit	180,700		
38.2	Los Angeles-San Fernando Valley Transit Extension; North-South bus transit	98,000		
44	Rte 47 (Terminal Island Fwy); interchange at Ocean Blvd Overpass in Long Beach	2,726		
54.1	Alameda Corridor East; grade separations, Los Angeles County	68,995	1,042	08/09
54.2	Alameda Corridor East; grade separations, Los Angeles County (Santa Fe Springs)	15,300	14,489	07/08
54.3	Alameda Corridor East; grade separations, Los Angeles County (Pico Rivera)	4,400		
58	Route 10; widen freeway through Redlands, Route 30 to Ford Street	5,704	12,473	04/05
63	Route 60; add 7 miles of HOV lanes west of Riverside, Rte 15 to Valley Way	21,000	7,381	04/05
70.2	Route 22; HOV lanes, Route 405 to Route 55 in Orange County (design/build HOV)	123,700		
73	Alameda Corridor East; (Orangethorpe Corridor) grade separations in Orange Co.	11,800	3,300	04/05
74.1	Pacific Surfliner; within San Diego Co. (Oceanside double tracking)	5,500		
74.3	Pacific Surfliner; within San Diego Co. (maintenance yard)	32,750		
75.2	San Diego Transit Buses; low-emission buses (NCTD)	7,700		
79	North County Light Rail; Oceanside to Escondido in San Diego County	80,000		
83.1	Route 15; managed lane project north of San Diego (Stage 1) (Transit elements)	23,000		
90	Route 99, widen freeway to 6 lanes, Kingsburg to Selma	16,140	42,616	05/06
91	Route 180; new expressway, Clovis Ave to Temperance Ave in Fresno County	7,439	36,781	08/09
92	San Joaquin Corridor; improve track & signals near Hanford in Kings County	10,000		
95	Route 41; improvements at Friant Road interchange in Fresno	8,070		
96	Friant Road; widen to four lanes from Copper Avenue to Road 206 in Fresno County	9,488		
97.1	Operational improvements near California State University at Fresno (City of Clovis)	215		
97.2	Operational improvements near California State University at Fresno (City of Fresno)	5,782		
99.2	San Joaquin Corridor; improve track and signals (Stockton to Escalon)	12,000	24,200	08/09
103	Route 99; improve interchange at Seventh Standard Road, north of Bakersfield	6,100		
107	Route 205, widen freeway to 6 lanes, Tracy to I-5	25,000	66,327	06/07
112	Jersey Avenue; widen from 17th Street to 18th Street in Kings County	1,500		
118	Sacramento Clean Air/Transportation Plan; reduce diesel engine emissions	34,500		
119.2	Low emission replacement buses (Yolo bus service operations)	1,227		
123	Oceanside Transit Center; parking structure	590		
159	Route 101, Steele Lane interchange, Sonoma County	6,000	13,759	04/05
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$915,690</b>	<b>\$226,768</b>	



**Traffic Congestion Relief Program  
Non-Construction Projects Ready in 2004-05  
(\$1,000's)**

#	Project Description	Phase(s)	New 2004-05 Allocation	Pending STIP Allocation	STIP FY
1.1	Extend BART to Downtown San Jose (Fremont to Warm Springs)	ROW	\$ 40,000		
1.2	Extend BART to Downtown San Jose (Warm Springs to San Jose)	Design, ROW	568,567		
2	Fremont-South Bay Commuter Rail; BART to San Jose (Alt project)	ROW	35,000		
11	San Francisco Bay Southern Crossing; feasibility and financial studies	Env	1,800		
12.1	Bay Area Transit Connectivity: I-580 Corridor study and improvements	Env	5,000		
14	CalTrain; extension to Salinas in Monterey County	Design, ROW	12,115		
16.2	Route 4 improvements, Contra Costa County (Liveridge Rd)	ROW	9,000	\$ 11,000	05/06
30	Commuter rail service, Marin-Sonoma	Env	1,200		
32.3	North Coast Railroad; complete of rail line from Willits to Arcata	Design	600		
32.4	North Coast Railroad; upgrade rail line to Class II or III standards	Env, Design	600		
32.7	North Coast Railroad; local match funds	Design	180		
32.9	North Coast Railroad; long term stabilization projects	Env, Design, R/W	6,030		
40	Route 10; add HOV lanes over Kellogg Hill, near Pomona	Design, ROW	37,959	35,848	05/06
42.2	Route 5; widen to 10 lanes (Segment B, Rte 605 interchange to Rte 710)	Env, Design	8,000		
42.3	Route 5; widen to 10 lanes (Segment C, Rte 710 interchange)	Env, Design	8,000		
43	Route 5; improve Carmenita Road Interchange in Norwalk	ROW	33,460	80,744	07/08
46	Route 1; reconstruct intersection at Route 107 in Torrance	Env, Design, ROW	1,300		
47	Route 101; California Street off-ramp in Ventura County	Design, ROW	3,380		
50	Route 71; complete 3 miles of 6-lane freeway through Pomona	ROW	17,000		
59	Route 10; Live Oak Canyon Interchange, Yucaipa	ROW	330		
77	Route 94; downtown San Diego to Rte. 125 in Lemon Grove	Env	6,000		
80	Mid-Coast Light Rail; extend Old Town light rail to Balboa Ave	Design	4,411	4,000	05/06
88	Route 5; realign at Virginia Av, approaching San Ysidro Port of Entry	Design	7,000		
98	Peach Ave; widen to 4 lanes, ped overcrossings for 3 schools, Fresno	ROW	2,200		
105	Route 99; 6-ln fwy, Madera Co Line to Buchanan Hollow Rd, Merced Co.	ROW	1,700		
106	Campus Parkway; in Merced County from Route 99 to Bellevue Road	Design, ROW	1,440	2,045	07/08
109	Route 132; 4-lane expressway in Modesto, Dakota Avenue to Route 99	ROW	1,859		
115	South Line Light Rail; extend 3 miles, Sacramento County	ROW	6,940		
116	Route 80 Light Rail Corridor; double-track, Sacramento County	Design	4,000		
128	Airport Road; reconstruction and intersection improvement, Shasta Co	Design, ROW	293		
157	Route 12; improvements from Route 29 to I-80 through Jamison Canyon	Env	1,900		
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$827,264</b>	<b>\$133,637</b>	



DATE: January 19, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Daryl Halls, Executive Director  
RE: STA Board Retreat to Discuss Funding CTP and New Initiatives

**Background:**

Each year, the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) identifies and updates its priority projects. These projects provide the foundation for the STA's overall work plan for the forthcoming two fiscal years. In follow up to the STA Board's approval of the FY 2004/05 and 2005/06 budget in July 2004, staff reviewed and updated all of the priority projects contained in the STA's Overall Work Plan (OWP). This topic was presented in a workshop styled format at the STA Board meeting of September 8, 2004 to provide members of the STA Board with the opportunity to query staff, discuss various projects and set priorities. In October 2004, the STA Board adopted its updated Overall Work Program/Priority Projects for Fiscal Years 2004/05 and 2005/06 consistent with the adoption of its two-year budget.

**Discussion:**

The updated OWP includes a list of 42 specific priority projects and programs. Several of these programs are new initiatives that will require the following: 1) Detailed analysis of the issue, 2) Development of implementation alternatives, specifics, and pros and cons for each alternative, 3) Initiation and implementation of an extensive public education, outreach and input effort, and 4) The development of consensus, collaboration and support for each of these specific programs among the Cities of Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville and Vallejo, and the County of Solano. Based on discussions with the new STA Chair Mary Courville and the STA Board's Executive Committee and the recognition that the successful implementation of several of these new efforts will require early participation and support by the STA's member agencies, the STA Board has scheduled a special Board Retreat on Thursday, February 17, 2005, at the Travis Credit Union in Vacaville. Both STA Board Members and their Board Alternates have been invited to attend and participate. Interested members of the STA TAC and the Transit Consortium are also invited to attend. At the meeting, staff will provide an overview of some of the proposed topics scheduled to be discussed by the STA Board at the retreat.

**Recommendation:**

Informational

Attachment:

- A. STA's Adopted Overall Work Program (Priority Projects) for FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06



**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06**  
 LAST UPDATED 9-29-04  
 (NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)

	PRIORITY PROJECTS	LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
1.	I-80/680/SR 12 Interchange A. Interchange EIR/EIS B. Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study (Completed) Status: Env Scoping Meeting held in May 2003. Environmental studies are underway. Estimated Completion Date (ECD): 2007	STA	TCRP	X	X	\$8.1 mil for EIR/EIS \$740 mil. -\$1 bil. (Capital cost)
2.	North Connector EIR/EA Status: Env Scoping Meeting held in March 2003. Environmental studies are underway. ECD: Spring/Summer 2005	STA	TCRP	X	X	\$2.7 mil for EIR/EA \$68 mil. (Capital Cost)
3.	I-80/680 Auxiliary Lane Project Status: Bids opened on 11/5/03. Construction started in March 2004. ECD: December 2004	Caltrans	ITIP SHOPP	ECD: December 2004		\$15 mil. (Capital Cost)



**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06**  
**LAST UPDATED 9-29-04**  
**(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

	PRIORITY PROJECTS	LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
4.	I-80-SR 12 West-Truck Climbing Lane Project Status: The project is in the 2004 SHOPP and is currently in design. Construction is scheduled to start in 2006 depending on the availability of SHOPP funds. STA to pursue construction funding for FY 05-06. ECD: 2007	Caltrans	SHOPP (2004)	X	X	\$7 mil.
5.	I-80 HOV Projects Status: A. SR 12 W to Air Base Parkway – This portion of the project is included as part of the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Project. Construction is programmed with RM-2 funds. ECD: 2008-2009 B. Air Base Parkway to I-505 – This project is Long-Term project #25 and is unfunded. 168	STA	TCRP RM-2  Unfunded	X	X	\$78 mil. (Capital Cost)  \$111 mil. (Capital Cost)
6.	I-80 Red Top Slide Project Status: North side complete. South side under construction. ECD: December 2005	Caltrans	SHOPP	ECD: Fall 2005		\$11.3 mil.
7.	I-80 Corridor Project PSR's Status: I-80/I-680/I-780 Corridor Study identified eligible projects. ECD: Recommended to be an ongoing program.	Caltrans STA	STIP STP/CMAQ Swap		X	NA

**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06  
LAST UPDATED 9-29-04  
(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

	PRIORITY PROJECTS	LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
8.	Develop funding strategy for I-80/680/780 Corridor Study Mid-term and Long-term Projects including Corridor Management and ITS. ECD: 2004/2005	STA	STIP-PPM	X		N/A
9.	Benicia-Martinez Bridge Status: After several delays, bridge construction is continuing. ECD: 2007	Caltrans	RM-1	X	X	\$1.1 bil.
10.	Hwy 12 Jameson Canyon EIR/EIS Status: Only \$4.1M in TCRP funds and \$1.5M in Napa STIP funds were allocated for the EIR/EIS. Caltrans has reported the EIR/EIS is back on schedule. ECD: 2006	Caltrans	TCRP STIP (Napa)	X	X	\$5.6 mil for EIR/EIS \$104 mil (Capital Cost)
11.	Highway 12 SHOPP Projects A. Road Improvements Scandia to Denverton B. Road Improvements Denverton to Currie Status: Environmental for both projects underway. Programmed in 2004 SHOPP Program. ECD: 2008 for both projects.	Caltrans	SHOPP SHOPP	X X	X X	\$36.5 mil.
12.	SR 12 MIS Operational Strategy Status: The Operational Strategy will provide a list of prioritized projects based upon the MIS completed in 2001. ECD: 2004/2005	STA	Gas Tax	ECD: 2004/2005		\$10,000

**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06  
LAST UPDATED 9-29-04  
(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

PRIORITY PROJECTS		LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
13.	S.R. 12 Re-alignment and Rio Vista Bridge Feasibility Study Status: Preparation of new planning grant application and request for support letters complete and submitted. Waiting decision by Caltrans. STP/CMAQ swap funds also available for funding. ECD: 2006	STA	State Planning Grant STP/CMAQ Swap		X	\$250,000
14.	SR29 MIS Status: New project, unfunded	STA	Unfunded		X	\$150,000
15.	Highway 37 Project A. Phases II B. Phase III and Landscaping Status: Construction is underway and on-schedule for both projects. ECD: January 2005 for Phase II and December 2005 for Phase III.	Caltrans	STIP ITIP, RTIP	X X	ECD: December 2005	\$118 mil.
16.	Highway 113 SHOPP Projects A. Maintenance Project (SR12 to Cherry)(Complete) B. In Downtown Dixon – Reconstruct SR 113 Status: Project A is complete. Project B is being designed by the City; approved in 2004 SHOPP. ECD: Project B – 2005.	Caltrans	SHOPP	X	Construction in Summer 2005	\$2.5 mil.
17.	SR 113 MIS Status: FY 2005-06	STA	STP/ CMAQ Swap		X	\$150,000

**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06  
LAST UPDATED 9-29-04  
(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

	PRIORITY PROJECTS	LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
18.	<p>Jepson Parkway Project A. EIS/EIR B. Walters Road Widening C. Leisure Town Interchange D. Update Concept Plan upon completion of Environmental</p> <p>Status: Project A is underway. Project B and C are under construction. ECD: Project A – 2005. Project B – 2004/2005. Project C – 2006. Project D – 2005/2006</p>	<p>STA Suisun City Vacaville</p>	<p>STIP Fed Demo Fed Demo Local Fed Demo STIP Local STIP</p>	<p>X  X X</p>	<p>  X  X</p>	<p>\$1.4 mil. \$6.1 mil. \$22 mil. \$25,000</p>
19.	Develop Local Interchange and Highway Landscaping Policies ECD: 2004.	STA	General Fund	Complete in 2004/05		NA
20.	Union Street/Main Street Reopening Feasibility Study Status: Draft is complete. ECD: 2004/2005	STA	STIP-PPM	Complete 2004/2005		\$10,000



**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06**  
**LAST UPDATED 9-29-04**  
**(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

	PRIORITY PROJECTS	LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
21.	Update of Countywide Traffic Safety Plan A. Highway Segments B. Local Intersections C. Safe Routes to Schools Projects Status: Update underway. ECD: Fall 2004/2005	STA	Gas Tax	Complete 2004/2005		\$5,000
22.	Congestion Management Program/Regional Impact Fee Study A. Phase 1 – Feasibility and Overview Options – 2005 B. Phase 2 – Implementation Plan Status: No action to date. ECD: A-2005; B-2006	STA	Phase 1 STP Planning STP/TLC Phase 2 Planning Unfunded	CMP Update and Phase 1	X	\$50,000 \$25,000
23.	Countywide Traffic Model/GIS A. Development of new model (traffic) B. Development of new model (transit) C. Maintenance of model Status: Phase 1 forecasts (traffic) underway; Phase 2 (transit) will commence in FY 04-05 ECD: Phase 1: December 2005; Phase 2: July 2005.	STA	RTIP STP-Planning NCTPA	X X Ongoing	Ongoing	\$360,000 \$80,000

**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06**  
**LAST UPDATED 9-29-04**  
**(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

	PRIORITY PROJECTS	LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
24.	Transit Management Service A. Route 30 Service Implement to Sacramento Complete Marketing B. Solano Paratransit Status: Ongoing C. Create, identify and increase awareness of Solano Paratransit Status: Ongoing Programs.	STA	TDA BAAQMD YSAQMD Fares STAF	Ongoing A. Marketing 2004/2005	Ongoing   X	\$177,000  \$494,000 \$5,000
25.	Local Transit Studies A. Rio Vista – Draft under review B. Fairfield C. Vallejo D. Benicia – Consultant retained 173 ECD: June 2005	STA Fairfield Vallejo Benicia	STAF	X X X X		\$36,000 \$60,000 \$60,000 \$20,000
26.	SR 12 Transit Study ECD: Summer 2005	STA	STAF NCTPA	X	X	\$25,000 \$15,000
27.	Transit Consolidation Study Status: To be initiated after completion of local Transit Studies. Initiate Summer 2005	STA	STAF	X	X	\$75,000

	PRIORITY PROJECTS	LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
28.	Community Based (CBO) Transit Planning A. Dixon - Completed - Sept. 2004 Dixon Implementation (04/05) B. Cordelia Study C. Vallejo Study ECD: Dixon, Completed; Cordelia, FY05/06; Vallejo, FY06/07	STA/MTC	CBO	X X	X	\$30,000 \$20,000 \$30,000
29.	Solano Works Plan Implementation A. Rio Vista LIFT Project Status: LIFT grant obtained and implementation underway.	STA	TDA LIFT TANF	X	X	\$99,000
30.	Capitol Corridor Rail Station- Fairfield/Vacaville Station and Fairfield-Suisun-Benicia track improvements. Status: Station and track improvements designs underway. \$25 million included in Regional Measure 2. Priority for federal funding. Status: Preliminary designs and environmental document for Fairfield/Vacaville Station to be completed by June 2005. Negotiations with Union Pacific initiated.	Fairfield/ Vacaville STA CCJPA	ITIP RTIP ADPE-STIP Local	X	X	\$35 mil. FF/VV Station

**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06**  
**LAST UPDATED 9-29-04**  
**(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

PRIORITY PROJECTS		LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
31.	Commuter Rail Stations A. Benicia B. Dixon Status: Environmental studies and Basis of Design Report underway for Benicia Intermodal Station; Plans underway for Dixon Intermodal Station; RTP funds expected to be moved into later years of 2004 STIP. Oakland-Sacramento Regional Rail Study is developing preliminary cost estimates for each of these stations. Further detailed feasibility analysis, track improvements and refined cost estimates will be needed for each station. ECD: Summer 2005 for Environmental Studies and Designs for Benicia. Dixon station construction in 2005.		RTIP E. CMAQ YSAQMD Clean Air Funds RM2	X X	X X	\$20 mil. \$20 mil. (Preliminary estimates for required track access and platform improvements.
32.	Commuter Rail Study Oakland to Sacramento (Auburn) Status: Track modeling underway to complete Phase 1 analysis; Phase 2 (implementation) analysis proposed to be initiated in 2005. ECD: Summer 2005 for Phase 2.	Sacramento Regional Transit District	STAF	X		\$25,000
33.	Phase 2 Napa Solano Rail Study Status: TBD	STA NCTPA		Completed		Initial Project Complete



**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06  
LAST UPDATED 9-29-04  
(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

PRIORITY PROJECTS		LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
34.	Baylink Ferry Support and Operational Funds A. Vallejo Station B. New Ferry  C. Maintenance Facility Status: Ongoing	Vallejo	RTIP Fed Demo Fed Boat TCRP Fed RM2  RTIP	X  X  X	X    X	\$52 mil.  \$10.8 mil.  \$0.5 mil.
35.	Development of STA's TLC Program  A. Further define/implement Land Use Strategies-TLC Best Practices Plan B. New TLC guidelines - completed C. TLC Corridor Studies (i.e. North Connector, Jepson Parkway and S.R. 12 Design Concept) funding strategy D. County TLC Plan - Completed  ECD: FY 2004-05	STA	Regional TLC CMAQ TE  STP-Planning	X Sept. 2004  Oct. 2004	X  X	\$68 mil. (Capital Costs)

**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06  
LAST UPDATED 9-29-04  
(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

	PRIORITY PROJECTS	LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
36.	Implementation of Countywide Bicycle Plan Priority Projects A. Solano Bikeway Feasibility-Phase 2 Vallejo-(Hiddenbrook) to Fairfield B. Jepson Parkway Bikeway (next phase(s)) C. Benicia Bike Route: State Park/I-780 D. Central County Bikeway gap closure (Marina Blvd.-Amtrak Station on SR 12 in Suisun City) Status: Countywide Bicycle Plan and new 5-year priority list completed in June 2004 ECD: Ongoing	Fairfield Fairfield/ Vacaville  Benicia	TDA-Art 3 TLC STIP CMAQ Regional Bike/Ped. Program	Ongoing  X X X X	Ongoing	\$5mil. -\$7 mil. (Capital costs)
37.	Countywide Pedestrian Plan and Implementation Plan. Status: Countywide Pedestrian Plan is completed.	STA Solano County	State TEA  Bay Trails TDA-ART3	ECD: Oct. 04		\$3.0 - \$5.0 mil. (Capital Cost)
38.	Solano Napa Commuter Information Program A. Marketing SNCI Program B. Full Incentives Program C. Completion of Guaranteed Return Trip (GRT) Program D. Employer/Vanpool Program E. Web Services Status: Marketing, Incentives, and implement GRT  ECD Jan. 2005 for GRT Program: others are ongoing programs.	STA	TFCA YSAQMD RIDES  CMAQ	Ongoing	Ongoing	FY 04-05 \$124,385 FY 05-06 \$99,354



**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06**  
 LAST UPDATED 9-29-04  
 (NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)

PRIORITY PROJECTS		LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
39.	STA Marketing/Public Information Program A. Website B. Events C. Transit Marketing brochures D. Route 30 promotion Status: Contract amendment with marketing consultant to develop new materials. Marketing Plan Development and Implementation ECD: Ongoing	STA	STAF Sponsors	Ongoing	Ongoing	FY 04-05 \$155,980 FY 05-06 \$146,000
40.	Monitor Delivery of Local Projects/Allocation of Funds Status: ongoing activity. ECD: ongoing activity.	STA	STIP-PPM STIP-TAP STP/STIP Swap	Ongoing	Ongoing	NA
41.	Develop a Funding Plan for the Solano County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) • Arterials, Freeways & Highways Element • Transit Element • Alternative Modes Element ECD: Spring 2005	STA	All Sources	X	TBD	\$4.6 billion Transportation Need over 25 years

**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR FY 2004-05 and 2005-06  
LAST UPDATED 9-29-04  
(NOT IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)**

PRIORITY PROJECTS		LEAD AGENCY	FUND SOURCE	2004-05	2005-06	EST. PROJECT COST
42.	Regional Measure 2(RM 2) Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vallejo Station</li> <li>• Solano Intermodal Facilities</li> <li>• I-80/680/SR 12 Interchange</li> <li>• Capital Corridor Improvements</li> <li>• Regional Express Bus North Capital and Operating</li> </ul>	Vallejo STA STA STA, CCJPA MTC	RM-2	Ongoing	Ongoing	\$28 million \$20 million \$100 million \$25 million \$ 16 million and \$3.4 million per year for operating (competitive)

Status: Funding reserves submitted



DATE: January 14, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Elizabeth Richards, SNCI Program Director  
RE: Status of Unmet Transit Needs Process for FY05/06

**Background:**

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4/8 funds are distributed to cities and counties based upon a population formula and are primarily intended for transit purposes. However, TDA funds may be used for streets and roads purposes in counties with a population of less than 500,000, if it is annually determined by the regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) that all reasonable unmet transit needs have been met.

Solano is the one county in the Bay Area that has local jurisdictions using TDA funds for streets and roads. Five out of eight jurisdictions currently use TDA funds for streets and roads (Dixon, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville and the County of Solano). Annually, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the state designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Bay Area, holds a public hearing in the fall to begin the process to determine if there are any transit needs not being reasonably met in Solano County. Based on comments raised at the hearing and written comments received, MTC staff then selects pertinent comments for Solano County's local jurisdictions to respond to. The STA coordinates with the transit operators who must prepare responses specific to their operation.

Once STA staff has collected all the responses from the transit operators, a coordinated response is forwarded to MTC. Evaluating Solano County's responses, MTC staff determines whether or not there are any potential comments that need further analysis. If there are comments that need further analysis, MTC presents them to MTC's Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC) to seek their concurrence on those issues that the STA or the specified transit operator would need to further analyze as part of the Unmet Transit Needs Plan.

If the transit operators, the STA and Solano County can thoroughly address the issues as part of the preliminary response letter, MTC staff can move to make the finding that there are no unreasonable transit needs in the county. Making a positive finding of no reasonable transit needs allows the five agencies who claim TDA for streets and roads purposes to submit those TDA article 8 claims for FY04/05. All TDA claims for local streets and roads are held by MTC until this process is completed.

**Discussion:**

MTC held its Unmet Transit Needs hearing for the FY05/06 TDA funding cycle on Wednesday, December 1 at the Ulatis Community Center in Vacaville. MTC is compiling the comments received at the hearing and those received through other means through

December 15, 2004. Although the STA has not yet received MTC's list of comments, MTC expects to forward them to the STA prior to the Consortium and TAC meetings on January 26. The STA will forward the comments electronically to Consortium and TAC members as soon as they are received.

At the Consortium, the comments will be reviewed and distributed to the appropriate transit operator to work with the STA in drafting a response to each of the issues. STA staff will draft a coordinated response for Solano County to MTC. The draft responses will be returned to the Consortium, TAC, and STA Board for review and approval before submittal to MTC. The goal is to secure the STA's Board approval by May 2005 to complete the MTC process by the end of June and allow the FY05/06 TDA claims to be promptly processed.

**Recommendation:**  
Informational.



DATE: January 13, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director for Projects  
RE: FY 2004-05 STP/CMAQ Projects

**Background:**

Projects funded with Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds are subject to the new project delivery guidelines and deadlines established by Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Solano County projects receiving STP and CMAQ funds in FY 2004-05 are shown in Attachment A.

**Discussion:**

Projects programmed in FY 2004-05 with STP and CMAQ federal funds must have the request for obligation to Caltrans by April 1, 2005. Additionally, these projects must be identified in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The amendment to the TIP to include the projects in Attachment A has been processed by MTC and should be approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) by mid-February.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

Attachment

A. MTC list of STP and CMAQ Projects for FY 2004-05

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
FFY 2004-05 Obligation Plan Status  
STP / CMAQ Funds  
January 1, 2005

County	Agency	Fund Source	Federal Project ID	TIP ID	Mode	Project Title	STP Program Amount	CMAQ Program Amount	Fund	STP Obligation Amount	CMAQ Obligation Amount	Obligation Date	Obligation Remaining Balance
Alameda	AC Transit	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		ALA010063	Bus	Acquire 416 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$68,000	CMAQ				\$68,000
Alameda	Alameda County	STP-T3-2-BF		ALA010048	Local Road	Vasco Road Safety Imps. - Phase 1	\$3,900,000		STP				\$3,900,000
Alameda	LAVTA	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		ALA030015	Bus	Acquire 25 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$203,000	CMAQ				\$203,000
Alameda	LAVTA	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		ALA030017	Express Bus	Express Bus - Route 70 and Subscription Routes - FY 04-05		\$89,000	CMAQ				\$89,000
Contra Costa	CCCTA	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		CC-030016	Bus	Acquire 103 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$114,000	CMAQ				\$114,000
Contra Costa	Clayton	STP-T3-2-SF-LSR		CC-050016	Local Road	Clayton Rd/Marsh Creek Rd Rehab	\$284,000		STP				\$284,000
Contra Costa	Danville	STP-T3-2-SF-LSR		CC-050021	Local Road	Diablo Road Rehabilitation (PSE)	\$13,000		STP				\$13,000
Contra Costa	Danville	STP-T3-2-SF-LSR		CC-050021	Local Road	Diablo Road Rehabilitation (CON)	\$520,000		STP				\$520,000
Contra Costa	Martinez	STP-T3-2-SF-LSR		CC-050018	Local Road	Alhambra Avenue Rehabilitation (CON)	\$534,000		STP				\$534,000
Contra Costa	Martinez	STP-T3-2-SF-LSR		CC-050018	Local Road	Alhambra Avenue Rehabilitation (PSE)	\$68,000		STP				\$68,000
Contra Costa	Oakley	STP-FY00RAB	STPL-5477(001)	CC-010012	Local Road	O'Hara Avenue Overlay	\$217,000		STP			PENDING	\$217,000
Contra Costa	Oakley	STP-FY00RE	STPL-5477(001)	CC-991053	Local Road	East Cypress Road Overlay	\$214,000		STP			PENDING	\$214,000
Contra Costa	Richmond	STP-T3-2-SF-LSR		CC-050015	Local Road	Carlson Boulevard Rehabilitation	\$309,000		STP				\$309,000
Contra Costa	Richmond	STP-GFY01TLC	STPLER-5137(028)	CC-010019	Bicycle	TLC - Richmond Greenway and Bikeway	\$1,900,000		STP			PENDING	\$1,900,000
Contra Costa	Richmond/BART	STP-FY01 HIP	5137	CC-010021	Pedestrian	HIP - Richmond Transit Village TransitPed Imp. (ENV)	\$145,000		STP			PENDING	\$145,000
Contra Costa	Richmond/BART	STP-FY01 HIP	5137	CC-010021	Pedestrian	HIP - Richmond Transit Village TransitPed Imp. (CON)	\$720,500		STP			PENDING	\$720,500
Contra Costa	Tridelta	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		CC-030017	Bus	Acquire 54 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$438,000	CMAQ				\$438,000
Marin	GSBHTD	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		MRND010032	Bus	Acquire 82 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$114,000	CMAQ				\$114,000
Region-Wide	BAAQMD	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		MTC050016	Other	AQ Strategy - Garbage Truck Repower / Catalytic Devices		\$2,000,000	CMAQ				\$2,000,000
Region-Wide	BAAQMD	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		MTC050017	Other	AQ Strategy - Hydrogen Fuel Cell Station		\$25,000	CMAQ				\$25,000
Region-Wide	BAAQMD	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		MTC050018	Bus	AQ Strategy - Spare The Air - Free Regional Transit		\$2,881,000	CMAQ				\$2,881,000
Region-Wide	BAAQMD	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		MTC050019	Other	AQ Strategy - Auto Catalytic Device Replacement - FFY 04-05		\$2,250,000	CMAQ				\$2,250,000
Region-Wide	BAAQMD	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		MTC980015	Other	Spare the Air - FY 04-05		\$1,000,000	CMAQ				\$1,000,000
Region-Wide	BART	STP-T3-2-BF		BRT050001	Rail	Platform Edge Tile Replacement Program	\$2,000,000		STP				\$2,000,000
Region-Wide	MTC	CMAQ-T3-1-RO	CML-6084(095)	MTC98002A	Bus	TransLink® FY 04-05 (CMAQ portion)		\$19,800,000	CMAQ		\$19,800,000	11/18/2004	
Region-Wide	MTC	STP-T3-2-RO	6084(###)	MTC980014	Bus	Regional Transit Information System (RTIS)		\$2,000,000	CMAQ				\$2,000,000
San Francisco	MUNI	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		SF-030008	Bus	Acquire 45 Motor Coach Clean Air Device Retrofit		\$385,000	CMAQ				\$385,000
San Mateo	SanTrans	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		SM-030018	Bus	Acquire 265 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$454,000	CMAQ				\$454,000
San Mateo	SanTrans	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		SM-030019	Express Bus	Express Bus - El Camino Real Corridor - FY 04-05		\$306,000	CMAQ				\$306,000
San Mateo	San Mateo Co	STP-T3-2-BF		SM-050024	Local Road	Pescadero Creek Road Resurfacing Project	\$310,000		STP				\$310,000
Santa Clara	VTA	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		SCL030021	Bus	Acquire 99 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$802,000	CMAQ				\$802,000
Santa Clara	VTA	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		SCL030021	Bus	AQ Strategy - 129 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$1,057,000	CMAQ				\$1,057,000
Solano	Dixon	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL	5056	SOL030001	Bus	Dixon Intermodal Facility		\$875,000	CMAQ				\$875,000
Solano	Fairfield	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		SOL030018	Bus	Acquire 24 Bus Catalyst Devices - FY 04-05		\$195,000	CMAQ				\$195,000
Solano	Rio Vista	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL	STPLER-5099(005)	SOL991091	Pedestrian	Rio Vista Main St. Improvements (CMAQ portion)		\$100,000	CMAQ				\$100,000
Solano	Rio Vista	STP-FY00RAB	STPLER-5099(005)	SOL991091	Pedestrian	Rio Vista Main St. Improvements (STP Portion)	\$37,500		STP				\$37,500
Solano	Solano County	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL		SOL050024	Bicycle	Vacaville-Dixon Bicycle Route		\$200,000	CMAQ				\$200,000
Solano	Vacaville	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL		SOL050025	Bicycle	Uplifts Creek Bike Path (PSE)		\$50,000	CMAQ				\$50,000
Solano	Vacaville	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL		SOL050025	Bicycle	Uplifts Creek Bike Path (ENV)		\$100,000	CMAQ				\$100,000



**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**  
**FFY 2004-05 Obligation Plan Status**  
**STP / CMAQ Funds**  
**January 1, 2005**

County	Agency	Fund Source	Federal Project ID	TIP ID	Mode	Project Title	STP Program Amount	CMAQ Program Amount	Fund	STP Obligation Amount	CMAQ Obligation Amount	Obligation Date	Obligation Remaining Balance
Solano	Vacaville	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL		SOL050025	Bicycle	Ulatis Creek Bike Path (CON)		\$250,000	CMAQ				\$250,000
Solano	Vacaville	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL		SOL050026	Bicycle	Southside Bikeway (PSE)		\$150,000	CMAQ				\$150,000
Solano	Vacaville	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL		SOL050026	Bicycle	Southside Bikeway (ENV)		\$150,000	CMAQ				\$150,000
Solano	Vacaville	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL		SOL050027	Bicycle	Centennial Park Bike Path (PSE)		\$150,000	CMAQ				\$150,000
Solano	Vacaville	CMAQ-T3-2-SOL		SOL050027	Bicycle	Centennial Park Bike Path (ENV)		\$150,000	CMAQ				\$150,000
Solano	Vallejo	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		SOL010033	Bus	Acquire 27 Bus Catalyst Devices - FY 04-05		\$219,000	CMAQ				\$219,000
Sonoma	Santa Rosa Bus	CMAQ-T3-1-AQ		SON030008	Bus	Acquire 22 Bus Catalyst Devices		\$179,000	CMAQ				\$179,000
							\$47,884,000	\$11,170,000	\$36,714,000	\$19,800,000	\$28,084,000		



DATE: January 13, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director for Projects  
RE: Project Delivery Update

**Background:**

The Bay Area has had an excellent record for project delivery over the six-year period of Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-First Century (TEA-21). The region delivered 110 percent of the federal Obligation Authority (OA) and 100 percent of the federal apportionment during this period and continues to receive additional OA due to this excellent record of delivering projects. Reemphasizing the current project delivery policy is important as the obligation deadline (April 1<sup>st</sup>) approaches for FY 2004-05 federally funded projects.

**Discussion:**

In an effort to maintain the Bay Area's excellent delivery record and to ensure the maximum amount of federal funds continue to flow to the region, in 2003 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Bay Area Partnership revised the regional policies for project delivery. The adopted policy is intended to strengthen the region's ability to deliver projects and establishes standard guidance for all regional STP and CMAQ programming cycles.

Although the region has been very successful in delivering federally funded projects, project packages submitted to Caltrans Local Assistance have often been delayed due to a variety of factors. Late submittal of project paperwork makes it very difficult for Caltrans Local Assistance to ensure the project can be submitted to Caltrans Headquarters and FHWA (or FTA) prior to the deadlines established by these agencies. Additionally, staffing for the Caltrans Local Assistance Office at District 4 has been reduced by 10 positions from 38 to 28. The current project delivery policy provides a more structured schedule for project submittals, allowing Caltrans Local Assistance to more effectively process requests from local agencies.

The primary components of the Project Delivery Policy are as follows:

- Funds must be obligated the same year as programmed in the TIP.
- Field reviews must be requested within 6 months of MTC's approval of the project in the TIP.
- Complete environmental submittal to Caltrans 12 months prior to obligation deadline.
- April 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for submittal of obligation request to "ensure" approval.
- New encumbrance/liquidation/project close-out deadlines.
- Sponsors with inactive projects may be subject to OA or programming limitations.

The goal of the current policy is to ensure the Bay Area continues to receive the maximum amount of federal funding in the TEA-21 Reauthorization by continuing to emphasize timely project delivery.

**Recommendation:**  
Informational.



DATE: January 13, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director for Projects  
RE: Regional Measure 2 (RM 2) Program Update

**Background:**

In March of 2004, Bay Area Voters approved Regional Measure 2 (RM 2) increasing the toll and seven state-owned Bay Area bridges from \$2.00 to \$3.00 beginning on July 1, 2004. Regional Measure 2 establishes the Regional Traffic Relief Plan and identifies specific transit operating assistance and capital projects and programs eligible to receive RM 2 funding. Solano County is eligible to receive RM 2 funds for a number of capital projects and express bus operations (see Attachment A).

**Discussion:**

Due to restrictions on using bridge tolls for transit operations on bridges receiving Federal funds, MTC was unable to award transit operations funds during the first half of FY 2004-05. MTC requested and received approval from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to use an "administrative" method for providing the transit operating funds by using only tolls generated from the five bridges in the Bay Area that do not receive Federal funds. This approval allows MTC to begin meeting the requirements of SB 916 (the RM 2 implementing legislation) for allocating RM 2 funds to transit operations.

Additionally, as part of the approval process for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Federal regulations require RM 2 capital projects to be included in the air quality conformity analysis for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). MTC has amended the RM 2 capital projects into the TIP (Amendment No. 5 to the 2005 TIP). These projects conform to the new air quality conformity analysis being conducted as part of the RTP (also called Transportation 2030). Although MTC provided the TIP amendment for all RM 2 projects for the initiation of the RM 2 program, in the future project sponsors will be responsible for updating their RM 2 projects in the TIP as allocations are received.

Project allocation requests are processed as they are received. The MTC website (see information in Attachment B) has information and a calendar outlining the specific dates required for allocation requests. As projects receive allocations, quarterly progress reports will be required by MTC from the project sponsor. MTC is currently developing a format for the quarterly reports.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

**Attachments:**

- A. Regional Measure 2 Solano County Projects
- B. MTC Memorandum, Regional Measure 2 Program Updates (December 15, 2004)

Regional Measure 2  
Solano County Projects  
(Costs in \$000's)

		FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	Future	
<b>RM 2 ANNUAL OPERATING</b>									
<b>Vallejo Ferry (\$2.7M/yr)</b>									
- Vallejo		100.0	2,700.0	2,700.0	2,700.0	2,700.0	2,700.0	2,700.0	
<b>Regional Express Bus North Pool (\$3.4M/yr)</b>									
- FST/Benicia (I-680)		120.1	126.1	132.4	139.0	146.0	1,700.0	1,700.0	
- Vallejo (I-80)		850.0	1,725.5	1,751.4	1,777.7	1,804.3	1,700.0	1,700.0	
<b>CAPITAL PROJECTS</b>									
<b>Vallejo Station (\$28M, Vallejo)</b>									
- Vallejo	Project Cost								Total RM2
		52,000.0							
			0.0	5,000.0	10,000.0				28,000.0
<b>Solano Express Bus Intermodal Facilities (\$20M, STA)</b>									
- Vallejo - Curtola		15,000.0							
- Benicia Intermodal (Ph 1)		5,000.0		200.0	3,000.0				6,000.0
- Fairfield Transportation Ctr		12,000.0			3,000.0				3,000.0
- Vacaville Intermodal (Ph 1)		9,000.0		200.0	4,500.0				5,500.0
				2,000.0	3,000.0				5,500.0
<b>Solano Corridor Near I-80/I-680 (\$100M, STA)</b>									
- North Connector (East end)		50,552.0							
- I-80 HOV Lane (12W to AB)		85,848.0			23,552.0				23,552.0
			1.0	1.0	10,346.0	64,102.0			74,450.0
<b>Capital Corridor Improvements (\$25M, CCJPA and STA)</b>									
- CCJPA Track Improvements		10,000.0							
- FF/VV Rail Station and Track Improvements		35,000.0		500.0	5,000.0	2,250.0			7,750.0
				800.0	9,000.0	6,950.0			17,250.0
<b>Regional Express Bus North (\$20M, \$4M Committed, MTC)</b>									
- Vallejo									
-- Curtola		15,000.0							
--				2,000.0	4,000.0				6,000.0
- FST									0.0
-- FTC Parking Structure		12,000.0							
-- I-680/Industrial PnR		2,075.0			2,500.0				2,500.0
-- Vacaville Intermodal (Ph 1)		9,000.0							1,500.0
									2,000.0

Regional Measure 2  
Solano County Projects  
(Costs in \$000's)

OTHER PROJECT CATEGORIES		FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	Future	Total RM2
<b>TransLink (\$22M, MTC)</b>									
- FST									0.0
- Vacaville									0.0
- Vallejo									0.0
<b>Real-Time Transit Info (\$20M, MTC)</b>									
- FST	5,000.0		1,000.0	1,000.0					2,000.0
- Vacaville									0.0
- Vallejo									0.0
<b>Safe Routes to Transit (\$22.5M, \$2.5 Committed)</b>									
- FST									
-- Bike Route to FF/VV Station	2,000.0			1,000.0					1,000.0
<b>SUMMARY OF PROJECTS REQUESTING RM 2 FUNDS FROM MORE THAN ONE CATEGORY</b>									
<b>Vallejo - Curtola</b>									
- Solano Express Bus Facilities		6,000.0							
- Regional Express Bus North		6,000.0							
	Total	12,000.0							
<b>Fairfield Transportation Ctr</b>									
- Solano Express Bus Facilities		5,500.0							
- Regional Express Bus North		2,500.0							
	Total	8,000.0							
<b>Vacaville Intermodal (Ph 1)</b>									
- Solano Express Bus Facilities		5,500.0							
- Regional Express Bus North		2,000.0							
	Total	7,500.0							



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
Tel: 510.464.7700  
TDD/TTY: 510.464.7769  
Fax: 510.464.7848

## *Memorandum*

TO: Regional Measure 2 Project Sponsors

DATE: December 15, 2004

FR: Melanie Choy and Vince Petrites

RE: Regional Measure 2 Program Updates

### **Regional Measure 2 Policies and Procedures**

On November 17, 2004, MTC approved an amendment to the Regional Measure 2 (RM2) Policies and Procedures. The amendment incorporates performance measures for transit operating assistance as well as minor technical amendments to the Policies and Procedures. The updated policies and procedures can be accessed online at: [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/RM2/policies\\_procedures.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/RM2/policies_procedures.pdf)

### **Inclusion into the 2005 Transportation Improvement Program**

As part of the approval process for the regional long-range plan, Transportation 2030 (T-2030), federal regulations require that the air quality conformity for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) be redetermined. This action also provides an opportunity for the region to amend new non-exempt projects, which have recently become fully funded through the passage of several local sales tax measures and Regional Measure 2 (RM2), into the TIP. Consequently, we have used the opportunity to amend the RM2 capital program funds and projects into the TIP. Generally, the RM2 operating program funds do not need to be included into the TIP. Amendment No. 5 to the 2005 TIP, conforms projects in the 2005 TIP to the new air quality conformity analysis being conducted as part of the T-2030 approval process. To review projects in the amendment, visit:

<http://www.mtc.ca.gov/publications/tip/tipind.htm> and select "Proposed TIP Amendments." Any comments or corrections are due to MTC by Monday, January 10, 2005. Amendment 05-05 will be presented to the Commission at its February meeting for approval.

In the future, project sponsors will be responsible for updating their RM2 project listing in the TIP based on approved RM2 allocations. RM2 funds in the TIP have been categorized as local, capital or operating. Only allocated funds are coded with capital or operating in the fund code and represent the approved cash flow plan from the approved MTC allocation resolution. Unallocated RM2 funds are coded with "local" to indicate a commitment of RM2 funding to the project in the TIP.

### **Website Updates**

MTC's website page for the RM2 program has been updated. You will find general information regarding the RM2 program and information for RM2 project sponsors and implementing agencies. The allocation process and various document formats are posted online for project sponsors or

implementing agencies that are requesting RM2 funding through both the capital and operating program. Please refer to <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/rm2.htm> for more information.

#### **Capital Program Allocation Requests**

MTC is currently processing the January allocation approval requests. Beginning with February allocation approval requests, the 60-day and 30-day deadlines for MTC staff receipt of the allocation request materials will be adhered to. If you intend to request a February allocation approval, please submit your allocation request by Wednesday, December 22, 2004. A calendar has been posted on the website outlining the specific dates for receipt of various documents (see <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/rm2capital.htm>).

To initiate an allocation, you may submit your allocation request (allocation request form and draft Initial Project Report) via e-mail to Melanie Choy at [mchoy@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:mchoy@mtc.ca.gov). Thereafter, MTC Staff will confirm receipt of your request and contact you to proceed with your allocation request.

#### **Operating Program Allocation Requests**

The Program for operating support of Regional Express Bus services (North and South) and Owl Service will be reviewed by the Commission in January. It is anticipated that operating allocations consistent with these programs will commence in February.

#### **Quarterly Progress Reports and Invoicing**

As a reminder, the first quarterly progress report for RM2 capital program allocations will be due on April 30, 2005 covering the period from the date of allocation to March 31, 2005. A format for the quarterly progress reports is forthcoming. Project sponsors should submit any quarterly invoices along with the quarterly progress report. A format for the invoices are available online and supporting documentation must accompany the invoices, including documentation of the derivation of your mark-up rate for direct staffing costs.

#### **For More Information**

If you have any questions or comments regarding the administration of the RM2 Program, please contact:

##### **Capital Program**

Melanie Choy at (510) 464-7865 or [mchoy@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:mchoy@mtc.ca.gov)

##### **Operating Program**

Vince Petrites at (510) 464-7742 or [vpetrites@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:vpetrites@mtc.ca.gov)

J:\PROJECT\\_RM 2\RM2 update.doc



## Regional Measure 2 Capital Program Allocation Requests

(As of December 30, 2005)

Below is a summary of the RM2 allocation requests submitted to MTC from project sponsors and implementing agencies for the upcoming months.

January 2005				
RM2 No.	Project Title	Sponsor/ Implementing Agency	Proposed Allocation Amount	Phase
20.2	Safe Routes to Transit Program	MTC/TALC/EBBC	\$45,000	Environmental (Planning)
Total			\$45,000	

February 2005				
RM2 No.	Project Title	Sponsor/ Implementing Agency	Proposed Allocation Amount	Phase
3	E-Line Historic Streetcar	Muni	4,290,000	Construction
18	Translink	MTC/ GGBH&TD	\$250,000	Environmental
Total			\$4,540,000	



DATE: January 14, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Anna McLaughlin, Program Manager/Analyst  
RE: Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) FY04/05 Six-Month Report

**Background:**

The STA's Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) program is funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) for the purpose of managing countywide and regional rideshare programs in Napa and Solano Counties and providing air quality improvements through trip reduction.

The STA Board approved the FY04/05 Work Program for the Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) Program in July 2004 (see Attachment B). The Work Program included ten major elements:

- Customer Service
- Employer Program
- Vanpool Program
- Incentives
- Rideshare Thursdays Campaign
- CA Bike to Work Campaign
- General Marketing
- Rio Vista LIFT SolanoWORKS
- CalWORKS Support
- Specialized City Services

With the completion of the first half of the fiscal year, SNCI progress on the Work Program is presented in Attachment A.

**Discussion:**

The SNCI program has had an active and productive first six months of Fiscal Year 04/05. Following are highlights of accomplishments from selected program elements.

*Customer Service and General Marketing*

Staff has responded to over 2,000 information phone calls and assisted over 1500 individuals at 32 employer and community events. Over 25,000 pieces of public transit materials have been distributed in addition to almost 10,000 SolanoLinks Brochures, Solano Yolo BikeLinks Maps, and Commuter Guides via phone and internet requests, events, and 102 display racks throughout Solano and Napa counties. The STA/SNCI van was wrapped and several dozen ads promoting SNCI services were published as well as a Commuter Guide insert into the Solano Magazine.

*Employer Program and Rideshare Thursdays Campaign*

The Rideshare Thursdays Campaign included a mailing of promotional materials to over 400 Solano and Napa employers. The campaign also included print advertisements and radio campaigns on KUIC and KVVN radio stations. Presentations, detailing the benefits of alternative commute programs, have been made to 6 employers and employee density maps have been created for 5 employers.

*Vanpool Program and Incentives*

The SNCI vanpool program is making progress with the formation of 9 new vanpools. To date, \$2,750 has been spent on commuter incentives with 25 individuals participating. The carpool incentive was targeted to residents in Benicia, Dixon, and Suisun City and 34 individuals registered. Participants are currently completing the required two months of carpooling to be eligible to receive their incentive.

*Welfare to Work Programs:*

The Welfare to Work Transportation Advisory met and developed three Low Income Flexible Transportation (LIFT) project proposals. These were submitted to MTC for LIFT grant funding. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been drafted and is being circulated to Rio Vista CalWORKs Vanpool Project partners for review and concurrence.

*Bike to Work & Specialized City Services:*

These activities are scheduled for implementation during the second half of the fiscal year.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

**Attachments:**

- A. FY04/05 Six-Month Progress Report
- B. SNCI Work Program FY04/05

## **Solano Napa Commuter Information FY04/05 Six-Month Progress Report**

### **1. Customer Service**

SNCI staff assisted over 2,000 individuals who called in requesting rideshare, transit, and other information. Over 700 carpool/vanpool matchlists were processed; 492 were for newly interested commuters and 213 were updates.

Tens of thousands of materials were distributed in response to phone calls, through numerous displays, at events, and through other means. Over 25,000 pieces of public transit schedules were distributed along with 4,390 SNCI Commuter Guides, 2,290 BikeLinks maps, and 2,814 SolanoLinks brochures.

### **2. Employer Program**

Employers throughout Solano and Napa Counties and a select few outside the counties have received a range of employer services. In October, all large Solano and Napa employers received Rideshare Thursday campaign packets to promote alternative transportation to their employees. SNCI program staff actively participated in the Solano BAAQMD Clean Air Coalition and Napa BAAQMD Clean Air Coalition. Presentations, detailing the benefits of alternative commute programs, have been made to 6 employers and employee density maps have been created for 5 employers.

### **3. Vanpool Program**

A total of 9 new vanpools have been formed. Two of these vanpools travel from the Sacramento area to Travis Air Force Base, two travel from Vacaville to the Sacramento area, and one travels from Vacaville to San Ramon.

Vanpool support is very important to maintain the existing strong vanpool fleet. Ongoing support has been sustained with the completion of 237 vanpool assists. Vanpool assists include processing Motor Vehicle Reports per Department of Motor Vehicle requirements, issuing Sworn Statement Cards, processing driver medical reimbursements, distributing van signs and/or bridge scrip, researching information for vanpools, etc.

### **4. Incentives**

The development and implementation of five commuter incentive programs continued: Vanpool Back-up Driver Incentive, Vanpool Formation Incentive, Carpool Incentive, Bicycle Incentive, and the Guaranteed Ride Home Program. During the past six months, \$2,750 has been distributed to these programs with 25 individual commuters participating. The two vanpool incentives are ongoing and continue to support new and existing vanpools. The carpool incentive program was marketed to the second set of target communities in Benicia, Suisun City, and Dixon in November 2004 and is ongoing. The bicycle incentive was fully implemented in September 2003 and is on-going. The program will be evaluated in early 2005 to

determine effectiveness. The Guaranteed Ride Home program is in the final stages of development.

**5. Rideshare Thursdays Campaign**

The purpose of this campaign is to encourage commuters to not drive alone at least one day a week on an on-going basis. The region-wide campaign kicked off in October 2004. Rideshare Thursdays (RST) ads were placed in monthly direct-mail magazines and web pages were created that allow commuters to register in the regional rideshare database and be eligible to win regional prizes. Additionally, KUIK in Solano County ran 8 weeks of radio advertisements and KVVN in Napa ran 4 weeks of radio advertisements. Staff completed a mailing to over 400 Solano and Napa employers, providing information and marketing materials for the RST Campaign and follow-up calls were made to the majority of these employers. The Campaign was kicked-off in October with a Rideshare Thursdays event in Downtown Napa. Preparation for the event included emails to employers, customized paycheck inserts and flyers, and an on-air interview on Napa's KVVN-AM radio show "St Helena Business." The second wave of the campaign will take place in April – June 2005 and will coordinate marketing and outreach efforts with Bike to Work Week and other events.

**6. California Bike to Work Campaign**

This fiscal year, Bike to Work Week is May 15 – 21, 2005. SNCI program staff will attend the kick-off meeting with MTC and the Bay Area Bicycle Coalition hired to organize the 2005 Bike to Work Campaign regionally for the first time. Solano/Napa Bike to Work campaign planning will begin in earnest once a regional schedule is presented by MTC in late January.

**7. General Marketing**

Staff maintained 102 display racks throughout Solano and Napa Counties with SNCI literature and regional transit information – an increase from 67 the previous year. A total of 32 events were staffed throughout Napa and Solano Counties: 6 employer events and 26 community events with 1,545 people served at these events and 6,498 pieces of rideshare and transit materials distributed. Additionally, the STA/SNCI van was wrapped with a colorful design promoting the program and the 800 phone number.

The SNCI Commuter Guide was inserted in the July/August edition of *Solano Magazine* and ads were placed in the Vallejo and Napa Chamber of Commerce Directories. Approximately 30 ads were run in local newspapers and monthly publications promoting general services, campaigns, and incentives.

**8. Rio Vista LIFT Solano WORKS Vanpool Project**

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has undergone several drafts by STA legal staff, as well as initial County of Solano staff review, during this time. In January 2005, it will be circulated to project partners City of Rio Vista and the County of

Solano for legal review and concurrence. This document is necessary to provide guidance to project implementation.

**9. CalWORKS (Welfare to Work) Support**

The Solano CalWORKS Transportation Advisory Committee was convened in August to provide support to a number of MTC LIFT grant proposals. Three proposals were submitted in support of CalWorks projects. SNCI took the lead on one submittal for an extended hours transit service. In December, MTC selected projects regionally for LIFT funding; none of these three projects were selected.

**10. Specialized City Services**

SNCI staff has been working with Rio Vista and Dixon staff to implement transit improvements and community-based transit planning project priorities, respectively. The development of Work Plans for Fairfield and Vacaville will occur during the second half of the fiscal year.

**Solano Napa Commuter Information  
Work Program  
FY04/05**

- 1. Customer Service:** Provide high quality, personalized rideshare, transit, and other non-drive alone trip planning services to the general public. Incorporate regional customer service tools such as 511, 511.org, TranStar and others.
- 2. Employer Program:** Be a resource to Solano and Napa employers who need commuter alternative information including setting up internal rideshare programs. Maximize these key channels of reaching local employees. SNCI will continue to concentrate efforts with large employers through distribution of materials, events, major promotions, surveying, and other means. Coordinate with Solano EDC, Napa EDC, chambers and other business organizations.
- 3. Vanpool Program:** Form 25 vanpools and handle the support of over 50 vanpools while assisting with the support of several dozen more.
- 4. Incentives:** Increase promotion of SNCT's commuter incentives. Continue to develop, administer and broaden the outreach of carpool, vanpool, and transit incentive programs. One additional incentive (emergency ride home) will be launched this year and the promotion of the existing incentives will increase.
- 5. Rideshare Thursday Campaign:** Work other agencies to plan and implement this new regional promotion to encourage commuters to not drive alone at least one day a week on an on-going basis.
- 6. California Bike to Work Campaign:** Take the lead in coordinating the 2005 Bike to Work campaign in Solano and Napa counties. Coordinate with key State, regional, and local organizers to promote bicycling locally.
- 7. General Marketing:** Maintain a presence in Solano and Napa on an on-going basis through a variety of general marketing activities for rideshare, bicycling, and targeted transit services. These include distribution of a Commuter Guide, offering services at community events, managing transportation displays, producing information materials, print ads, radio ads, direct mail, public relations, cross-promotions with other agencies, and more.
- 8. Rio Vista LIFT SolanoWORKS Vanpool Project:** Implement vanpool program designed for SolanoWORKS clients who live in Rio Vista. Administer two vanpools to travel from Rio Vista to Fairfield and manage multi-agency grant.
- 9. CalWORKS Support:** Manage SolanoWORKS Transportation Advisory Committee, coordinate with County of Solano Health and Social Services, and support Napa CalWORKS clients in need of transportation services. Partner with other agencies and seek funding for eligible projects.
- 10. Specialized City Services:** Work with member agencies to develop and implement targeted services and outreach in their communities. Initiate development and implementation of Work Plans for Fairfield and Vacaville.



DATE: January 14, 2005  
TO: SolanoLinks Intercity Transit Consortium  
FROM: Anna McLaughlin, Program Manager/Analyst  
RE: SNCI Monthly Issues

**Background:**

Each month, the STA's Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) program staff provides an update to the Consortium on several key issues: Napa and Solano transit schedule status, Partnership Regional Transit Marketing Committee, Solano Welfare to Work, and promotions. Other items are included as they become relevant.

**Discussion:**

- 1. Transit Schedules:** The monthly transit schedule matrix was distributed to all Solano and Napa operators the week of January 17th via email. Based on the response received, an updated transit matrix will be provided at the meeting.
- 2. Partnership's Regional Transit Marketing Committee (RTMC):** There is no January meeting scheduled.
- 3. Welfare to Work (Solano):** No recent meeting
- 4. Promotions:** There are currently no regional promotions occurring. The first Bay Area Bike to Work TAC will be meeting on January 24<sup>th</sup> to begin planning the regional campaign. This year, Bike to Work planning efforts are being headed by the Bay Area Bicycle Coalition. SNCI is also in the process of evaluating the fall Rideshare Thursdays campaign and planning for the spring campaign.
- 5. Events:** SNCI has been staffing information booths at events where transit information is distributed along with a range of commute options information. Recent events include the ribbon cutting ceremony at the Fairfield Transportation Center Phase II and Solano Community College. Upcoming events include the University of Phoenix Student Appreciation Week.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.